



**FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE**

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-128
Tuesday
3 July 1990

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-128

CONTENTS

3 July 1990

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Bogachev Urges Accord Between U.S. Words, Deeds [TASS]	1
Vienna Talks 'Success' on Armor Numbers Reported [PRAVDA 30 Jun]	1
Article Urges Change in U.S. Strategy [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 26 Jun]	1

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

NATO Plan Deemed 'Absolutely Unacceptable' [ADN]	4
CSCE Conference on Human Dimensions Ends [TASS]	4
'International Situation' on START Problems [Moscow Radio]	4
'Observers Roundtable' Views International Issues [Moscow Radio]	5
Poland's Mazowiecki Cited on German Unification [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 26 Jun]	9
Popov Says West Lacks Clear-Cut Aid Strategy [Moscow International]	9
International Energy Exhibition in Moscow Ends [TASS]	9
Consortium To Publish Business Paper [IZVESTIYA 28 Jun]	10

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

U.S. Intelligence Agency Opposed to Cable Link [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 28 Jun]	12
'Chill' Seen in Bush-Mandela White House Talks [PRAVDA 28 Jun]	12
U.S.-Soviet Citizens Diplomacy Conference Cited [TASS]	13

China

Further on Emigration of China's Fang Lizhi [IZVESTIYA 29 Jun]	14
Solidarity Meeting With Chinese Group Continues [IZVESTIYA 29 Jun]	14

Northeast Asia

Gorbachev To Make First Leader's Visit to Japan [RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 23 Jun]	15
Northern Islands Trusteeship With Japan Proposed [Tokyo KYODO]	15
South Korean President's Aide Interviewed [IZVESTIYA 30 Jun]	16
DPRK Navy Delegation Visits Primorskiy Krai [Moscow International]	17
DPRK Leaders Send Thanks to Gorbachev, Ryzhkov [IZVESTIYA 29 Jun]	17
Greetings to DPRK Mark Month of Solidarity [TRUD 24 Jun]	17
DPRK Light Industry Delegation Visits Crimea [Moscow International]	17

Near East & South Asia

Foreign Ministry Statement on Jewish Settlement [TASS]	18
Pretext for Ending PLO Dialogue 'Contrived' [PRAVDA 25 Jun]	18
Afghanistan's Najibullah on Reconciliation Policy [PRAVDA 25 Jun]	19
Afghan PDPA Renounces Monopoly on Power [PRAVDA 28 Jun]	19
Congress Ends, Party Renamed [PRAVDA 29 Jun]	20

East Europe

Halt on Troop Withdrawal From Hungary Threatened [Budapest Radio]	21
More on Hungarian Plan To Leave Warsaw Pact [IZVESTIYA 28 Jun]	21
Exhumation of Graves of Polish Officers To Begin [Warsaw PAP]	21

Growing Rift in Poland's 'Solidarity' Noted [IZVESTIYA 26 Jun]	22
Stasi, KGB Accused of Terrorism in GDR [PRAVDA 28 Jun]	22
Romania's Iliescu Thanks Gorbachev for Greetings [IZVESTIYA 30 Jun]	22
Ryzhkov Congratulates Romania's Prime Minister [TASS]	23
Sitaryan, Yugoslavia's Markovic Discuss Trade [TASS]	23

Latin America & Caribbean

Relations With Cuba May Jeopardize U.S. Aid [Moscow International]	23
Rear Admiral Gorbunov Leads Naval Visit to Cuba [TASS]	25
Warships End Visit [TASS]	25
Cuba's Castro Offers Aid to Chernobyl Victims [TASS]	26

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Gorbachev's First 100 Days as President Viewed [KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 24 Jun]	27
'Thwarted Ambition' Drove KGB Whistle-Blower [PRAVDA 28 Jun]	29
KGB Criticizes Excesses on Border Troops Day [Moscow Radio]	31
'Whole Truth' on Semipalatinsk Site Urged [IZVESTIYA 1 Jul]	31
TV Reportage on Conference [Moscow TV]	32
Conference on Future of Nuclear Power Held [Moscow TV]	33
Commission on Soviet Germans Holds Session [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 28 Jun]	33
Democratic Platform Holds All-Union Conference [KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 17 Jun]	34
Journal Editors View Trends in Print Media [PRAVDA 10 Jun]	34
Lack of Supplies Disrupts Printing Houses	38
Delays Seen in Far East [IZVESTIYA 16 Jun]	38
Ukraine Severely Affected [SELSKAYA ZHIZN 19 Jun]	39
Russian Writers Describe Trip to U.S. [LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA No 21]	39
28 June Aircraft Hijack Attempt Thwarted [PRAVDA 29 Jun]	44
Central Committee Greets Institute Graduates [PRAVDA 22 Jun]	44
Boris Yeltsin's Book To Be Serialized [KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 24 Jun]	44
Obituary for Nuclear Physicist I.M. Frank [PRAVDA 25 Jun]	44
Soviet 'Who's Who in World Politics' Published [TASS]	45

Economic

Gosplan Head Interviewed on Economic Situation [PRAVDA 30 Jun]	45
Cities Propose Creation of Free Economic Zones [Moscow International]	48
Aganbegyan Heads Commission on Market Transition [IZVESTIYA 1 Jul]	48
Economic Academy Opened to Competitive Entry [Moscow TV]	49
Procedure for Buying Goods From Foreigners Given [IZVESTIYA 28 Jun]	49
Stary Oskol To Produce Construction Items [Moscow TV]	50

Agricultural

Farm Chairman Comments on Increased Grain Prices [Moscow TV]	50
Metal Shortage Halts Combine Harvester Output [Moscow TV]	51
New Prices for Grain Mean Higher Incomes [Moscow International]	51

Scientific

'Mir' Cosmonauts Prepare for 'Intense' Day [Moscow Radio]	51
Causes of White Sea Poisoning Remain Obscure [IZVESTIYA 26 Jun]	52
Fears Over Mukachevo Radar Station Rebutted [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 29 Jun]	52
Chief of Soviet Cable TV Interviewed [PRAVDA 25 Jun]	53

Military

Yeltsin Interviewed on Army Reform [Moscow TV]	53
Lizichev Interviewed on Party Role in Army [Paris LIBERATION 30 Jun-1 Jul]	55
General Ivashov Comments on Conscription Changes [Moscow TV]	56

Panel Discusses Reform, Problems in Military	[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 27 Jun]	57
Safety Worries Rise Over Scrapping Nuclear Subs	[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 28 Jun]	62
Defense Committee Members Visit Northern Group	[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 26 Jun]	63

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Ryzhkov Discusses Choice Facing Lithuania	[Belgrade TANJUG]	64
Flow of Oil to Lithuania Resumes	[Moscow TV]	64
All Sanctions Against Lithuania Lifted	[IZVESTIYA 3 Jul]	64
Prunskiene Sees Talks With Moscow as Next Step	[TASS]	64
Leaders Discuss Changes, Talks With Moscow	[Vilnius Radio]	65
3 Jul Lithuanian Supreme Council Session Reported	[Vilnius Radio]	65
Commentator on Party Congress Eve Discussion	[Moscow TV]	65
Baltic Party Leaders Hold Press Conference	[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 30 Jun]	66
Letter on Latvian Party Support for Gorbachev	[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 22 May]	67
Opposition to Latvian Declaration Voiced	[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 15 May]	68
Latvian USSR Constitution Group Goals Viewed	[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 22 May]	68
Latvian Supreme Soviet Suspends Union Budget Law	[Moscow TV]	69
Attacks on Journalists' Rights Protested	[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 22 May]	69
Estonia's Ruutel Greets RSFSR Congress	[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA 1 Jun]	70
Estonian Politician on Independence, Gorbachev	[Vienna DIE PRESSE 2 Jul]	70
Estonian Banking System Seen as 'Pure Illusion'	[PAEVALENT 14 Jun]	71
Estonia's Titma Discusses Yeltsin, Gorbachev	[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA 2 Jun]	71

RSFSR

Yeltsin Opens 3 Jul Supreme Soviet Session	[Moscow Radio]	76
RSFSR Supreme Soviet To 'Last Until 12 Jul'	[Moscow Radio]	76
RSFSR 'Decree on Power' Published	[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 25]	76
RSFSR Supreme Soviet Committees Formed	[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA]	76
Resolution on Nuclear Waste State Program Viewed	[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 28 Jun]	77
Resolution on Election of Soviet of Republic	[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 21 Jun]	77
First Secretary Polozkov Tours Bryansk Oblast	[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 30 Jun]	78
Resolution Seen on 'Mechanism of Sovereignty'	[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 22 Jun]	78
Trade Minister Kurenkov on Market Development	[PRAVDA 14 June]	79
RSFSR Economic Sovereignty Plan Proposed	[EKONOMIKA I ZHIZN No 23]	80
Stankevich Describes Moscow Soviet Session	[Moscow Radio]	86
Soviet 'Moscow' Deputies Appeal	[VECHERNYAYA MOSKA 30 May]	86
Gidaspov Interviewed on Multiparty System	[London TV]	87
Vorotnikov Views Party's 'Degree of Blame'	[Moscow TV]	87
Moscow Official Senses Air of Change	[TASS]	88
Leningrad Mayor, Party Chief View Congress	[London TV]	88
Sverdlovsk Soviet Head Vlasov Voted Out	[IZVESTIYA 28 Jun]	89
Social Democratic Party Sets Up Western Group	[Moscow Radio]	89
Social Democratic Party Formed in Dagestan	[IZVESTIYA 26 Jun]	89
Trade Unionists Campaign for Worker Rights	[Moscow Radio]	89
Russian Leaseholders' Split Avoided	[IZVESTIYA 16 Jun]	90
Moscow Journalists Union Constituted	[Moscow Radio]	90
Moscow Starts Privatizing Housing, Consumer Trade	[IZVESTIYA 1 Jul]	90
Perm Exhibition To Be Used as Business Center	[Moscow TV]	90
Rally in Archangel Protests Nuclear Test Site	[Vilnius Radio]	91
Anti-Nuclear Protests Held in Ural Regions	[Moscow Radio]	91
Liquor To Be Rationed in Leningrad	[Moscow Radio]	91

Western Republics

'Moldovan Peoples Front' Congress Ends		91
Debates on Issues Viewed	[IZVESTIYA 3 Jul]	91
New Charter, Program Adopted	[TASS]	92

Moldavian Party Congress Discusses Draft Platform [PRAVDA 19 May]	92
Cities Reject 'Moldova' Constitution [IZVESTIYA 28 Jun]	93
Moldavian Premier Forced To Resign [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 26 May]	93
Moldavian Government Officials Appointed [SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA 6 Jun]	93
Moldavia's Snegur Views Situation, Reforms [MOSCOW NEWS No 23]	93
Moldavian Daily Appeals Against Becoming Weekly [SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA 18 May]	95
Ukrainian Deputies View Prime Minister's Report [Kiev Radio]	95
Ukrainian Social Democrats Congress Continues [Kiev Radio]	96
Ukrainian Komsomol Congress Votes for Name Change [KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 19 Jun]	96
Militia Prevent Attendance at Poltava Rally [KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 24 May]	96
Gorbachev Sends Belorussia Message on Chernobyl [IZVESTIYA 1 Jul]	97
Belorussian Supreme Soviet Session Held 23 Jun [PRAVDA 24 Jun]	97
Belorussian Central Committee Plenum Held [PRAVDA 24 Jun]	97
*Thousands Allegedly Destroy Party Cards [SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIA 6 Jun]	98
Minsk Leader's Attacks on 'Center' Assailed [IZVESTIYA 26 Jun]	98
Western Attitudes on Sovereignty Analyzed [LITERATURNAYA UKRAYINA 21 Jun]	99

Caucasus

Armenian Nationalists Take Police Hostage [AFP]	100
Armenian Pannational Movement Holds Rally [Yerevan International]	100
Armenian National Army Chief Claims Denied [KOMSOMOLETS 14 Jun]	100
Major General Nechayev Counters Armenian Claims [TRUD 24 Jun]	101
Armenia Expresses Sorrow Over Iranian Earthquake [Yerevan International]	102
Renewed NKAO Body Urged by Armenian Leader [Yerevan Radio]	103
Situation in Nagorno-Karabakh Reported [IZVESTIYA 29 Jun]	103
NKAO Organization Committee Announcement Seen [Baku Radio]	104
Council of Ministers Decision on NKAO Viewed [Baku Radio]	104
NKAO People's Control Committee Suspended [Yerevan Radio]	105
Dashdamirov, USSR Supreme Soviet Work on Treaty [Baku Radio]	105
Yazov Receives Azerbaijanis Living in Moscow [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 29 Jun]	105
Azerbaijan's State Security Chief Visits Rayons [Baku Radio]	105
Aviation Official Discusses Stepanakert Flights [Baku Radio]	105
Azerbaijan Workers Appeal to Supreme Soviet [Baku Radio]	106
Azerbaijan Border Rayons 'Extremely Tense' [Baku Radio]	106
Party Aktivs Meet in Kelbadzharskiy Rayon [Baku Radio]	106
Georgian Komsomol Organizations Disbanding [MOLODEZH GRUZII 8 Jun]	107

Bogachev Urges Accord Between U.S. Words, Deeds

LD0207193390 Moscow TASS in English 1845 GMT
2 Jul 90

[By TASS military analyst Vladimir Bogachev]

[Text] [no dateline as received]—Judging by recent reports from Washington, rapid changes in the military-political sphere are now spreading from Europe to the United States.

Only a few days ago, U.S. Secretary of State James Baker said he doubted that the NATO summit, due to open in London on July 5, would urge the alliance to discard the flexible response doctrine, which envisaged the first nuclear strike and the following escalation of the use of nuclear weapons in the event of a conflict on the European continent.

Citing diplomatic sources, THE WASHINGTON POST now reports that President George Bush has proposed that NATO reconsider this dangerous strategy.

A few days ago, U.S. General John Galvin, commander in chief of NATO troops in Europe, expressed hope that NATO front-line defence would move farther east, to encompass East German territory.

However now, President Bush's presummit message to the leaders of NATO member-countries voices support for radical changes in the advanced frontiers' defence concept. THE NEW YORK TIMES notes that Bush proposed cutting NATO forces deployed near the borders of the two blocs.

In an interview with West European and Japanese journalists, the U.S. President declared that Washington was ready to join the nonaggression pledge as regards Warsaw Pact member-countries.

Against the background of these declarations to bring NATO strategy into line with the actual situation in Europe, the practical measures that are being undertaken by NATO and the United States look strange, to say the least.

The CBS reports that despite the end of the cold war, U.S. F-15s regularly take off from NATO's West European airfields to intercept "token targets" in the East.

In keeping with Washington plans, these F-15s, as well as F-16s and F-111s in West Europe, are expected to be equipped with hundreds of new nuclear air-to-surface missiles, capable of hitting targets deep in Soviet territory.

Most observers believe that reports of changes in American war strategy aim to appease the Soviet Union's anxiety and gain its agreement to United Germany's membership in NATO. Others say that NATO's London summit "will not become the venue for major decision-making, but will provide an opportunity to please all the differing audiences at a critical moment in Europe's political life."

Washington has put forward some promising proposals concerning changes in its military strategy and undertaken some alarming practical plans to build-up NATO's nuclear potential. The best sign from Washington about its good intentions with respect to the Soviet Union, so much spoken about in the West at present, would be an accord between its words and deeds.

Vienna Talks 'Success' on Armor Numbers Reported

PM0307091590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
30 Jun 90 Second Edition p 7

[Report by own correspondent I. Melnikov: "Path to a Solution"]

[Text] Vienna, 29 Jun—Last Wednesday there was a great sigh of relief in the Hofburg Palace: The elaboration of reduction levels for tanks and armored vehicles was completed! This important event did not even take place at a plenary meeting of the Vienna talks, but at a modest session of experts. However, the accredited correspondents reacted immediately—now one can definitely say that there has been a powerful burst of speed at the talks.

What is the nature of the success?

The reduction levels were agreed as a result of discussions in working groups. For example, on tanks—perhaps the hardest nut to crack at the talks—it was decided that each alliance, NATO and the Warsaw Pact, should have no more than 20,000. This figure covers all tracked and wheeled tanks weighing 16.5 tonnes and over.

Armored vehicles (they include armed equipment weighing less than 16.5 tonnes) are divided into three groups—infantry fighting vehicles, armored carriers, and heavily armed armored vehicles. Each alliance would be able to have no more than 30,000 vehicles, and levels have been set for each group of equipment.

The path to a solution was not easy. It came about as a result of long and complex discussions and balanced consideration of the security of East and West. The summit talks in Washington were of paramount significance in terms of finding a compromise, by stating that a draft treaty on the reduction of conventional armed forces would be ready by the fall.

Article Urges Change in U.S. Strategy

PM0207132590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 26 Jun 90 First Edition p 3

[Observer Aleksandr Golts article under the rubric "Viewpoint": "Time To Change Strategy"]

[Text] As the U.S. press reports, tense "summit meetings" are now going on in Washington. And though these talks are not being held with representatives from foreign countries, but between leaders of the administration and Congress leaders, they are not progressing with ease.

After all, their subject is the country's budget for fiscal 1991. The White House is sparing no efforts in defending the government programs from the merciless knife of the legislators, who have conceived the idea of balancing the budget by cutting federal expenditure.

This would seem to be an exclusively domestic matter, and does this topic merit much attention? I think it does. The echo of the current budget storms across the ocean may reverberate on this side of the Atlantic and around the planet as a whole. It is no secret that a significant part of federal expenditure goes on military spending. It is this that is the chief cause of everyone's anxiety.

The disputes in the United States are going on not only over the military budget figure, but also over the Armed Forces' structure, and consequently also over plans for their future development. Thus, assessing the Pentagon's draft budget, L. Aspin, chairman of the House of Representatives Armed Services Committee, stated bluntly that it is based on outdated assessments which do not reflect the improvements in relations between the USSR and the United States.

Simultaneously the administration has to repel an attack on another front—from the conservatives. Those on the right wing claim that, having signed the document on agreed positions on reducing strategic offensive arms with the USSR president, G. Bush has all but betrayed national interests. The topic of strategic offensive arms, incidentally, is never out of U.S. newspapers, which cannot be said of our press. After a brief conceptual analysis in M.S. Gorbachev's speech in the Supreme Soviet, the strategic offensive arms problems have practically not been discussed, crowded out by stormy internal political events.

As for representatives of the U.S. Administration, then, speaking both in Congress and the press, they never tire of proving that the future treaty is advantageous to the United States. Thus, the secretary of state bluntly stressed that this treaty "is built on American conceptions and American proposals." He considers it one of the most important achievements that in accordance with the arrangement Soviet "heavy" missiles, which caused most anxiety to the U.S. side, will be reduced by half. In the secretary of state's interpretation restrictions which do not affect a single type of U.S. weapon are extending to these particular missiles.

U.S. experts also treat the rules for counting sea- and air-launched cruise missiles as a success. After all, they afford Washington the opportunity of having 800-900 missiles more. On this point, if I understand the situation correctly, in reality this gap might be greater. For example, a limit of 880 units has been fixed for sea-launched cruise missiles. The American program for this type of weapon has long been under way. The U.S. Navy already has almost one-half of the number mentioned. While the Soviet Union has no such missiles. That is, the USSR will face a choice: To spend considerable

resources on developing systems analogous to the Americans', or asymmetrical to them, or to agree to a numerical superiority on the U.S. side.

In conditions when even after reductions both sides will retain a nuclear potential capable of destroying all life on the planet many times over, such an imbalance, as I see it, might be acceptable. At the same time, unequal reductions from the numerical viewpoint must not lead to qualitative changes. Parity must not be violated. Moreover, in such a situation it appears natural for the SALT I Treaty to become the prologue to an agreement on even deeper cuts in nuclear forces, during which the imbalances outlined would be evened out.

The United States' actions in the transitional period acquire particular importance in my view. Just now it would be sensible for our partners to conduct affairs in such a way that Moscow has no fears that Washington intends to turn a possible numerical inequality to its advantage.

In this connection Washington's views on the U.S. Armed Forces' future are of considerable interest. Let me say in all fairness that the military department too is having to reckon with the rapid changes in the world arena. Thus, Secretary of Defense R. Cheney has had to review proposals for military expenditure three times. At the present time a long-term plan of military construction has been devised as a result of consultations with senior generals and secretaries of the Air Force, Navy, and Army. It provides for, specifically, a 25 percent reduction in the U.S. Armed Forces in the period 1992 through 1997. According to U.S. press reports, its thrust is a decrease in the number of personnel by 442,000 servicemen. The Pentagon proposes to disband six regular divisions of ground forces and marines and four reserve divisions. The Pentagon considers it possible to decrease the number of Navy ships from 566 to 455. It is also proposed to disband 11 tactical wings and four squadrons of strategic aviation.

True, at a press conference the secretary pointed out that this project, prepared at the request of legislators, should be considered as an "illustration" of possible Armed Forces reductions and by no means as new administration proposals on the military budget. Let us note here that this plan in no way affects existing modernization programs for U.S. strategic nuclear forces.

According to press data, the Pentagon has agreed to decrease the number of B-2 "Stealth" strategic bombers only slightly. The cost of this bomber has exceeded the most fantastic forecasts. (However, General J. Chain, commander in chief of U.S. Strategic Air Command, does not agree with this. He thinks that the B-2 will become "a central element of nuclear deterrence in tomorrow's world").

At the same time, American strategists do not intend, it seems, to scrap plans to develop the "Midgetman" mobile missile and to deploy MX missiles in the future.

Moreover, even in budget reduction conditions, AVIATION WEEK AND SPACE TECHNOLOGY magazine reports, the Navy command intends, after three years' dithering, to carry out the program for purchasing "Tomahawk" cruise missiles. Simultaneously modernization work on them will be carried out.

And by the end of the century the Navy Department intends to deliver into service yet another generation of nuclear missile weapons of this type. As THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR testifies, at the present time work is in full swing on the elaboration of a cruise missile incorporating the "Stealth" technology, capable, moreover, of moving at supersonic speed. It is not the only forward-looking project in the sphere of nuclear missile weapons. But I have deliberately dwelled on plans connected with cruise missiles. If the projects are really as the American press reports them, then it signifies that the Pentagon intends to strengthen whatever advantage it might get from the SALT Treaty from the qualitative standpoint, too.

Finally, what Washington has again started saying about the SDI makes us cautious. The other day the secretary of defense gave his assurance that this "star wars" program will remain inviolable under any reductions. And he backed this up with the fact that it is the SDI

which must prevent an attack on the United States... from the developing states. It is very doubtful whether a program of developing space weapons is just the sort of resource that a great power must use in order to remove the threat of attack from developing countries. It is more likely that SDI, implemented in conditions of large-scale reductions of strategic offensive arms, is regarded by the Pentagon as an important component of U.S. military strikepower.

However, these programs, on which the Pentagon is insisting, by no means strike the imagination. In the years of confrontation we saw projects which were a bit more biting. So why do they cause anxiety? Merely because right now Moscow expects different approaches from Washington.

As was said way centuries ago, "an age, having changed its customs, begs a different style." And, in switching from confrontation to cooperation, it is of course time for the United States to change the style of its military policy. And this must be done primarily so that no military programs, perhaps implemented only by militarist inertia, break such a delicate thread of mutual trust. It is this trust which is a guarantee that cooperation to free the planet of a terrible threat will be continued in the future.

NATO Plan Deemed 'Absolutely Unacceptable'

LD0107151790 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1435 GMT 1 Jul 90

[Text] Hamburg (ADN)—According to Nikolay Portugalov, Mikhail Gorbachev's adviser on Germany policy, a "membership in NATO for all-Germany, without cutbacks, is absolutely unacceptable" for the Soviet Union. In an interview for the BILD newspaper (tomorrow's edition), which appears in Hamburg and was pre-released to ADN, he said that the security interests of the Soviet Union must be protected.

The FRG wants an all-Germany in NATO with only one concession: a provisional, special military status of the present-day GDR. "If our troops remain there for a transitional period, then only by the grace of NATO. U.S. Secretary of State Baker has said already that he cannot promise that after a Soviet 'troop' withdrawal NATO will not expand into the present-day GDR. In addition, the U.S. nuclear presence in the Federal Republic—and thus in a future all-Germany—is to be preserved. No, no one can demand that we accept a settlement that so clearly is at our cost," the politician emphasized. He hopes that these questions can be resolved by unification at the end of the year.

In reply to a question from BILD, the Germany expert said that in the Soviet Union settling the external political aspects of German unification has a strong internal policy component. "The conservatives within the Communist Party are trying to concoct an antiperestroyka plea out of it." Summarized in a demagogic way, it sounds rather convincing for the man on the street in our country: 40 years after the war that was won we leave the field as losers; at least, it looks that way. There probably will be arguments because of this at the party congress.

CSCE Conference on Human Dimensions Ends

LD3006010190 Moscow TASS in English 1541 GMT 29 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondents Nikolay Vukolov and Yevgeniy Kiselev]

[Text] Copenhagen June 29 TASS—The Second Conference on the Human Dimension ended in Copenhagen today after four weeks of discussion in the Bella Centret Hall, with delegates saying "See you in Moscow" to one another.

While the first such meeting, part of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, took place in Paris, the third, and final one, will be held in the Soviet capital in September next year.

Speakers from various countries in Copenhagen agreed that the latest forum has laid solid groundwork on the way to the Moscow conference, including an important, wide-ranging final document which details the CSCE human dimension concepts, and was a landmark even in humanitarian cooperation among the CSCE countries.

Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovskiy described the final document as marking change for the better in some vital aspects of Pan-European affairs. "One can speak with confidence that progress has started towards a single CSCE democratic space, governed by the principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, other international pacts and the Vienna accord: on Humanitarian cooperation," he said.

Petrovskiy said the document clearly defines a rule-of-law state and the initial parameters of the supremacy of laws, meaning that the year-old Soviet-French idea of a single legal space has begun to be translated into reality.

It is now essential to jointly build the foundation of a common European home and design the latter's humanitarian aspects, Petrovskiy said.

He described the document as a major step in the field of human rights and personal liberties and as being rich in ideas, agreement on which seemed inconceivable merely a year ago.

The thrust of the Copenhagen document, Petrovskiy continued, is in line with domestic changes in the Soviet Union. He hoped that the Moscow conference will further accelerate the CSCE process and help internationalise efforts to ensure the primacy of universal human values throughout the European space.

'International Situation' on START Problems

LD2906205790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0030 GMT 29 Jun 90

["International Situation—Questions and Answers" program presented by Andrey Ptashnikov, all-Union radio commentator on foreign politics, with Vladimir Nikolayevich Chernyshev, TASS observer on military matters; Viktor Levin, commentator; and Sergey Pravdin, commentator]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] [Ptashnikov] Now, as I promised, let us talk about disarmament problems, about what positive things were achieved in this field in the course of the latest Soviet-American summit meeting. The only difficulty is that it is simply impossible to give a detailed account of all issues in the reduction of military arsenals in a single program. Therefore, we shall dwell just on strategic offensive weapons today. Since we obviously cannot manage without a specialist's opinion here, I have invited Vladimir Nikolayevich Chernyshev, the TASS observer on military matters—whom I think you already know, comrades—into the studio.

[Passage omitted] [Ptashnikov] All the same, as far as I understood, not all issues connected with the future treaty on reducing strategic offensive weapons have yet been resolved. What problems still remain?

[Chernyshev] Unfortunately, you are right. There are still some obstacles on the way to the signing of the

treaty. This means, primarily, the problem of testing heavy missiles. The United States does not have such missiles, but we do: 308 SS-18 missiles, so called according to the U.S. interpretation. We have expressed a readiness to reduce their numbers by a half, to 154, but we want to reserve the right to perform test launches of them. But the United States objects to that. Evidently, there is something here for both the Soviet and U.S. specialists and academics to ponder: to define where the permissible limit to modernization lies, and where a qualitative arms race might begin.

The second problem is that the United States is trying, figuratively speaking, to sell the same cow twice over. On its insistence, the Soviet medium-range bomber Tu-22M, or Backfire in their code, has been included as a subject for the negotiations on conventional Armed Forces in Europe, which are currently in progress in Vienna. But Washington is trying to include it in the category of strategic weapons as well, meaning that we are supposed to take it into account twice. After all, the Soviet Union declared back in 1979 that it would not give that aircraft the properties of inter-continental range, so it cannot be put in the strategic category. Our country is prepared to confirm that obligation today too, but no more than that.

Finally, the problem of non-fulfillment of the treaty remains unresolved. The United States claims that it has a cooperation program in Great Britain, under which it can give London any types of strategic weaponry: sea-launched ballistic missiles, intercontinental missiles, cruise missiles, and so on. But that makes the whole treaty meaningless. What do reductions in U.S. arms change if they are handed over to the British? Now, when the main provisions of the treaty have been fixed and the USSR and the United States are aiming to sign it by the end of this year, the question of the British and French nuclear forces naturally arises. In these conditions, the U.S. formula—to hand over nuclear weapons and the means for modernizing them to the British without restriction—is, of course, totally unacceptable to the Soviet Union.

Thus, as you see, fairly serious issues remain, but solutions can be found to them as well.

[Ptashnikov] Well, let us hope so. Thank you, Vladimir Nikolayevich. [passage omitted]

'Observers Roundtable' Views International Issues

LD0107182290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1130 GMT 1 Jul 90

["International Observers at the Roundtable" program with Gennadiy Vedenyapin, not further identified; Viktor Levin, All-Union Radio foreign political commentator; and Yuriy Emmanuilovich Kornilov, TASS political observer]

[Excerpts] [Vedenyapin] Hello, esteemed listeners. We are beginning our regular conversation "International

Observers Roundtable," and this is Gennadiy Vedenyapin, its presenter, at the microphone. With me I have my colleague Viktor Levin, All-Union Radio foreign political commentator, and Yuriy Emmanuilovich Kornilov, TASS political observer.

I should like to begin our conversation with the very important document which was published in the press this week—the draft party program statement for the 28th CPSU Congress. Naturally, it contains a section dealing with foreign political matters. It is quite short, compact, but in my view meaningful and succinct. So, what are the guidelines for our foreign policy? What does the party advocate? First and foremost, the energetic continuation of the successfully begun demilitarization of international relations; a reduction of arms and armed forces to levels of reasonable defensive sufficiency; and the total exclusion of the use and the threat of force in world practice. Naturally, there is also the lowering and subsequently the total overcoming of military confrontation. We are for the creation of global and regional security systems based on the balance of interests of all parties. We are for underpinning relations between states with a juridical foundation in order to guarantee freedom of social-political choice, and for the normalization of Soviet-U.S. relations. The party considers that the combining of efforts by all members of the international community in resolving the large problems confronting mankind will become the imperative in world politics. Therefore, the CPSU advocates vigorous joint action concerning ecology and the elimination of starvation, poverty, mass epidemics, and international terrorism. We advocate the intensive expansion of inter-economic ties and joint action and cooperation with all international organizations acting from a historic sense of responsibility for the future of mankind. The CPSU advocates overcoming the historic split in the socialist movement and developing cooperation with communist and workers—not only with these but also with socialist, social democrat, and in general with all organizations and movements advocating peace, democracy, and social progress.

Naturally, such a position on our part presupposes a tolerant attitude to the pluralism of opinions which exists in the world. I think you will agree with me that, regrettably, here in our country as yet the yearning for this pluralism—or rather, we are not beset by any excessive yearning for this pluralism of opinions. This was shown also by the recent Constituent Congress of the Russian Communist Party, though it should rightfully be said that Western democracies too sometimes commit the same sin.

Incidentally, Viktor Nikolayevich, today the treaty between the GDR and the FRG comes into force—this very day. It would be interesting to hear your view about how far it takes account of the balance of interests of the two Germanies, of that very pluralism of interests and opinions, if you like. What is your view?

[Levin] Well, if the question is put in that way, then it needs to be said quite forthrightly that what is going on is not the taking into account of the interests of two German states, but rather the swallowing-up of the GDR by the FRG. I remember how, on the eve of 18 March, elections to the People's Chamber—elections which effectively predetermined the development of events—the Party of Democratic Socialism [PDS] came out under the slogan "We are one people." One to one. At that time, one to one was a very popular concept inasmuch as the citizens of the GDR were very much bothered about the exchange arrangement for West German and East German marks, and everyone was eager that the exchange should be one to one.

[Vedenyapin] Yes, but how far was this slogan, this call, implemented?

[Levin] Well, that really comes a bit later. But to answer your question now, to a certain extent, yes, but to a maximum of 30 percent. However, the PDS was posing the question in a broader way. One to one meant that the GDR should not be swallowed up by the Federal Republic, but rather there should be a unification of two states resulting in the formation of a new state, one which would be not a direct follower of the FRG.

[Kornilov] Perhaps successor would be a better word.

[Levin] Yes, one could say that. One which would not be a direct successor to the FRG or a direct successor to the GDR. But this did not happen. It did not happen because of a whole series of circumstances, following from the fact that the majority of the GDR population—and there's no getting away from this—voted for rapid reunification. And they did so on the rather simple-minded assumption, it seems to me, that the day after reunification, the benefits of life in the FRG would become benefits of life in the GDR too.

[Vedenyapin] Yes, automatically.

[Levin] Yes, forgetting that any benefits have to be earned. [passage omitted: Levin goes on to emphasize that from today there is only one currency and to recapitulate the arrangements for conversion of savings; GDR citizens are likely to find surprises in store when they go shopping since their own rates of pay are lower; Vedenyapin asks how their experience of moving to the market economy is likely to compare with that in the USSR; Levin says it will be similar though some of the discomfort may be cushioned by FRG help; moving on to external aspects of German unification, Kornilov recalls the Soviet proposal at the two-plus-four talks for a ceiling on German armed forces; Levin says the West's initial negative reaction is now softening and it is being suggested that the matter be referred to the Vienna talks; Vedenyapin notes that a commitment has been expressed that Germany would not produce or stockpile nuclear, chemical, or biological weapons]

[Levin] At this point I would like to raise another question, one which is very often posed by our listeners

if one is to judge from their letters: Does our country's security suffer as a result of the reunification of the two German states, by the creation of a united Germany? I think that if the conditions under discussion at the two-plus-four talks, and the principles being hammered out there are worked through to the point of being mutually acceptable, our security will not suffer in any degree. Moreover a united Germany might—and I think there is a certain basis for this estimation—become a bridge between East Europe and Western Europe. It should never be forgotten that the 40 years during which two independent German states have existed—45 years since the end of the war—have not failed to leave their mark. Very profound conclusions have been drawn in the FRG, while in the GDR a generation of people has grown up which bears very warm feelings for our country. And it needs to be said—I have had the opportunity to see for myself in Berlin this year how deep these feelings are.

[Kornilov] It is worth remembering that this conversation of ours is taking place literally on eve of a meeting of NATO leaders in London. This is to be an important meeting. The implementation of the main things we are talking about will, in my view, depend to a large extent on the outcome of that meeting for what is intended in London is to work out a new strategy, a new structure for NATO. And if NATO in this sense makes moves to respond to the measures being implemented by the Warsaw Pact, and if we tilt sharply toward political cooperation, then a quite different situation will exist in Europe.

[Vedenyapin] Yes, undoubtedly. Incidentally, Secretary of State Baker held a briefing this week on the subject of this forthcoming summit of NATO member countries' leaders. He confirmed that the main point on the agenda was to be a review of the North Atlantic alliance's strategy, to take account of the organization's continuing aims, and what he called the new challenges which NATO is facing today. I should like to single out two points, two keynotes in what he had to say. James Baker stressed, in particular, that it is necessary to assist the peaceful, democratic, and economic changes taking place in East Europe and the Soviet Union. I regard this as a gratifying statement. Then another point which also puts one in an optimistic frame of mind: The secretary of state said that at this summit meeting which is to review NATO strategy, an examination is to be made of how NATO can help to increase the effectiveness of the CSCE which he described—in a remark I consider to be very apt—as the conscience of the continent.

[Levin] Indeed, a great deal depends on the path NATO takes, and it needs to be said that in the final analysis the question of the future military-political status of a united Germany also depends directly on what happens in the North Atlantic bloc. If it too moves toward becoming a political organization, if it too changes sharply as the Warsaw Pact is doing, then it seems to me that in that case a united Germany's membership of NATO will acquire a nature completely different from how it looks,

quite different from the way it looks today. However, while talking about positive processes, we cannot overlook an event which I honestly cannot regard as positive, namely the decision by the Hungarian Parliament to embark on a broad range of talks so as to first terminate Hungarian participation in the military organization of the Warsaw Pact, and later—by the end of 1991 if I am not mistaken—to leave the Pact.

[Vedenyapin] So we are back to the question of pluralism of interests?

[Kornilov] Yes, the future of the Warsaw Pact is a subject of very lively debates. Moreover, those taking part in these debates, with all their pluralism of opinions indeed, appear to agree on one thing: Today, when such tempestuous changes have swept over Europe—and not only Europe—the Warsaw Pact cannot but undergo the most profound changes if it wishes to play a constructive role in developing and perfecting European cooperation and security structures.

[Levin] Let us return to Hungary, for it seems to me that it is not out of place to recall that the Warsaw Pact, like NATO, has not always existed—far from it. NATO was created in 1949, and the Pact in 1955. As you see, NATO had existed for six years before the Pact came into being. In other words, to return to the roots of the matter, there was a time when Europe was able to get by without these two opposing blocs.

[Vedenyapin] Yes, that is true. But I think that today it is especially important to emphasize something else. The Warsaw Pact came about in particular historical conditions and acted or operated in an atmosphere of acute confrontation, both military and ideological. Then, when the situation began to change for the better, it was precisely the Warsaw Pact which was the first to embark on transforming its activities in all spheres, including the military sphere, and suggested that the NATO countries should start moving in the same direction.

[Kornilov] In other words, what is happening is that today, when we are faced with—let us say this again—fundamentally different and new European and world realities, it is essential to change the very nature of the relationship between the two alliances, to reshape their structures and functions so as to subordinate all these transformations to one purpose—the transition from confrontation to cooperation and joint action over the broadest range of questions.

[Vedenyapin] But attitudes to this in the West are not unambiguous—this needs to be recognized. Let me, for instance, draw your attention to a statement made by FRG Foreign Minister Genscher. On the eve of the NATO forum in London, he stresses that the North Atlantic alliance must renounce old thinking based on the image of the enemy. But it would be an error to overlook the fact that forces do exist in the West which continue to openly call for the retention of old militarist doctrines. There are public figures putting round scare stories about the political situation here in the USSR

supposedly being unstable and the Soviet military threat supposedly being capable of becoming a reality again tomorrow.

[Levin] A distinction needs to be made here, of course. I would say the fact that the internal political situation in the Soviet Union is complex should not be disputed.

[Kornilov] It should not be, it should not be.

[Levin] Yes, unfortunately that is how it is. But as regards the Soviet military threat, I think all the same that however events develop, the threat is receding.

[Vedenyapin] Undoubtedly. But just a couple of words more to illustrate what I was saying. Speaking in Paris on 21 June, NATO Secretary General Manfred Woerner said the following: Who can foretell today how the Soviet Union may behave in the face of the enormous problems concerning the unity of its empire and the weakening of its international positions? I would say there is some sense in this.

[Kornilov] Yes, and the conclusion Woerner draws is clear too. Here is what he says: While instability and uncertainty form the background to events now unfolding, we shall need an appropriate combination of nuclear and conventional forces. To me it seems that such a tone and such approaches can hardly be said to assist the pooling of efforts in consolidating security.

[Levin] Actually, you know, I find myself thinking that as NATO secretary-general, Manfred Woerner is obliged to say this sort of thing, particularly since to all appearances high office places obligations not only on NATO leaders, but on Pact leaders as well, especially the military part of it. I have in my hands a book entitled "The Warsaw Pact, Past and Present" [Varshavskiy Dogovor, Istoriya i Sovremennost], which has only just—I repeat, only just—been published by the Military Publishing House. The book's general editor is Army General Lushev, and it brings together much factual material of importance, interest, and I think of course value to readers. At the same time however, I get the impression that the authors are simply unable to get away from the old blueprints, from the talk about the danger threatening us on the part of aggressive forces, and about the need for vigilance on the part of the allied armed forces, meaning—and I quote—a clear class stance, intransigence toward aggressors, and ardent hatred of them. Well to me, you know, these are in fact postulates from the stone age. I would be curious to know....

[Kornilov, interrupting] The whole thing's curious.

[Levin] What do these words clear class stance mean for, let's say, the armed forces of today's Czechoslovakia or Hungary, and toward which aggressors—specifically the servicemen of those states—should feel ardent hatred.

[Kornilov] I agree that appealing for hatred at all—and ardent hatred at that—strikes a discordant note. It is

phraseology from the past, and to base our contemporary propaganda, for instance, on postulates like this would only disorient people.

[Levin] Let's think about what it actually means. On the one hand, the draft keynote statement for the 28th CPSU Congress underlines the need to energetically continue the demilitarization of international relations successfully under way; and there's something else I would like to say here. If we review the foreign political activities of our party leadership, first and foremost of General Secretary Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev—in his capacity as both general secretary and president of our country—what we see is a notable and substantial, or to put it plainly, a fundamental reinforcement and consolidation of the Soviet Union's security. The situation in Europe today is incomparable with that of five years ago, and when many of our comrades warily say... [changes thought] Some generals are even asking how it can be that we are meekly withdrawing from countries liberated by our fathers, as if we were given the eternal right to keep those countries under our heel. One has to bear in mind, comrades, that the changes in East Europe—and these are changes to be welcomed—are also affecting the West part of the continent. Changes are happening everywhere, and we now have every reason for saying that security has improved.

This, of course, is leaving a serious imprint. Just consider: We are saying, I repeat, or Gorbachev is saying—in particular on 8 June at a press conference in Moscow in connection with Margaret Thatcher's visit to the USSR—that we regard Western representatives not as enemies, but as partners in building new relations in Europe.

[Vedenyapin] Which makes it all the less understandable why, in this new situation, the Military Publishing House continues talking about hatred toward aggressors.

[Kornilov] Especially as there are one or two things one might add to this collection of odd—to put it mildly—pronouncements. There's an article by Captain Gams in the journal *International Affairs*, for instance, where in respect of the Soviet-U.S. treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles, a treaty regarded the world over as the first real step toward nuclear disarmament, he claims that the document is all but a diplomatic defeat for our country. Yet Gams is not only an army captain—he's also a USSR people's deputy.

[Levin] Reliance on force has always been a catalyst for confrontation, as Soviet Defense Minister Marshal Yazov said recently in an interview to PRAVDA. One can only agree with him, but to make an honest analysis of the relatively recent past one has to acknowledge that this perfectly correct tenet applies not only to NATO policy, however unpleasant this may be for us. The facts must be acknowledged, however. We need only think back to the aggravation of the world situation in August 1968 when our tanks appeared on the streets of Prague, or our troops' entry into Afghanistan. So are we now to

return to the past? No idle question, given that of late some have been patently prompting us to regard the world exclusively as an arena of irreconcilable confrontation between social systems. From a variety of platforms, we are now hearing more and more distinctly, and in my view obsessively, one and the same theme—parity is in jeopardy, the balance of force is about to be disrupted.

[Vedenyapin] Well, the subtext to all this is, I think, as follows: Our foreign policy which is geared to decisive progress in curbing the arms race and building trust should, as they see it, be reviewed. Then there would be no need for a military reform and all our generals and admirals—of which, I believe we have more than anyone else in the world—would keep their comfortable armchairs and I imagine no less comfortable holiday cottages.

[Levin] Incidentally, it was reported this week that in order to save resources, the U.S. Army has decided to quite substantially cut the number of generals and admirals, though even in proportional terms, the U.S. army has immeasurably fewer generals than we do.

[Kornilov] Immeasurably fewer. The public all know that until quite recently we were spending up to 18 percent of our national income on defense measures, which is more than in any other country in the world.

[Levin] As for the attempts to frighten people with an imaginary weakening of our security, these are I am convinced unworthy. Speaking at the inaugural conference of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Communist Party on its final day, and replying indirectly it seemed to me to General Makashov, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev very clearly confirmed that we shall not permit a reduction of the strategic balance. And speaking a few days later at a reception in honor of graduates from our military academies, the USSR president stressed that the prevention of war and a reliable defense sufficiency form the core of the new Soviet military doctrine. If, as it would appear, this doctrine is not to the liking of some of our military men, then it is more a reflection on them, as we say, but it must be recalled once more that the Army exists for the people and not vice versa.

[Vedenyapin] Incidentally, what Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said can be proved most cogently, and with specific facts and figures too.

[Kornilov] Yes you're right. It would probably be a good idea to devote one of our roundtable meetings entirely to the subject, perhaps inviting some military specialists to take part. For today, in the context of what has been said, I would like to note that any kind of militant calls and totally unfounded statements about a weakening of our defense capability do nothing whatsoever to help establish the new political thinking in line with today's realities.

[Levin] But, in principle, it's perfectly natural to have different approaches and differing viewpoints on foreign policy and other issues.

[Vedenyapin] Yes, of course, and this is not the first time we've spoken of this. Still, solutions to the problems posed by life clearly are not to be found in these incantations about threats from the West, or indeed in the search for the infamous Soviet threat. One is therefore tempted to ask whether it is not in fact time for the advocates of such old and—to them—so familiar confrontational outlooks to cast off these gloomy clichés of the past and place the accent in their speeches and writings, not on the search for an enemy or on East-West confrontation but on a sober, calm, and—most importantly—serious analysis, one conforming to the spirit of the times; of how the multifaceted East-West process of transition from confrontation to constructive partnership is developing; of who is helping this wholesome process; and who and for what reasons is hindering it?

[Kornilov] I'm convinced that it is from this viewpoint that we should examine the issue of the future of the Warsaw Pact and NATO, the issue with which we in fact began this discussion. It is, I repeat, indeed a complex issue and one ought to take a sober view of the situation within NATO, given the....

[Vedenyapin interrupting] But nobody is denying anyone the right to be apprehensive in this respect.

[Kornilov] No, of course not, of course not. Yet there can be, and without doubt will be, only one way ahead—progress toward a new all-European security system. Only such a system can guarantee the preservation of an international equilibrium and fruitful peaceful interaction. This, it seems to me, is a political axiom today.

[Vedenyapin] Undoubtedly. Anyway, thank you. Our time has run out, and I would like to thank our listeners for their attention and my international affairs journalist colleagues for taking part in our roundtable discussion today. Goodbye comrades, and all the best. Until the next time.

Poland's Mazowiecki Cited on German Unification

PM2906124790 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 26 Jun 90 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Renouncing Hostility"]

[Text] Warsaw, 25 Jun—The renunciation of hostility in relations with neighbors, which remained as a legacy of the past, and the forming of contacts with them not on the basis of the "two enemies" theory but on the basis of close cooperation with both the USSR and Germany have enormous significance for Poland. T. Mazowiecki, chairman of the Polish Republic Council of Ministers, emphasized this idea when speaking in the city of Szczecin.

We have already been living in a different world for a year, and a principal role in its birth was played by the

struggle of the Poles and their tireless striving for freedom, he emphasized. The reforms begun by M.S. Gorbachev in the Soviet Union had enormous significance for the realization of Poland's aspirations.

T. Mazowiecki stressed that he regards the unification of the two German states with understanding, a unification dictated by the need to overcome once and for all the consequences of the "cold war" and of the split in Europe. At the same time this process generates uncertainty regarding the aspirations of the future united Germany. In the first place, it is to do with the territorial changes which occurred as a result of World War II. Thanks to Poland's efforts in the international arena, its interests were taken into account and this is borne out by the invitation to the Polish Republic to take part in the conference under the "two-plus-four" formula, at which problems regarding Germany's borders and the security of its neighbors will be discussed. T. Mazowiecki welcomed the declarations on security and inviolability of borders along the Odra and Nysa Rivers adopted a few days ago by the two German states' parliaments. Poland sees the documents as the foundation of future relations between the peoples of both countries. T. Mazowiecki expressed the hope that a treaty between Poland, the GDR, and the FRG which would settle problems of mutual relations in legislative form will be worked out and agreed even before the unification of Germany.

Touching on the Polish Republic's internal political problems, the head of the cabinet said that the main aim is to build a democratic country.

Popov Says West Lacks Clear-Cut Aid Strategy

LD0107085390 Moscow World Service in English
0700 GMT 1 Jul 90

[Text] The mayor of Moscow says the West lacks a clear-cut strategy on the issue of economic aid to the countries of East Europe. Professor Gavril Popov, himself a prominent economist, addressing an international conference in Vienna, suggested the idea of concentrating Western economic aid within a sort of another Marshall Plan to be coordinated by an international council.

International Energy Exhibition in Moscow Ends

LD0107212190 Moscow TASS in English 2058 GMT
1 Jul 90

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Kumachev]

[Text] Moscow July 2 TASS—The International Energy-90 Exhibition, which ended at Moscow's Sokolniki Park on Saturday, enabled Soviet enterprises and organizations to establish new business contacts with foreign partners.

The exhibition involved 45 firms and organizations from Austria, Britain, Italy, Norway, the Soviet Union, the United States, Finland, France, West Germany, and Switzerland.

They displayed technical facilities for the production and distribution of power, traditional and alternative sources of electric power, energy-saving technologies and environmental protection equipment.

The holding of the exhibition became the first joint activity of the Soviet-West German venture Moskovskaya Yarmarka (Moscow Fair) established by a number of Moscow organisations together with the Glahe Internationale KG.

The attention of Soviet specialists was attracted in particular by the exhibits of the Austrian firm Voest-Alpine (equipment for nuclear power stations), the Finnish A. Ahlstrom (boiler room equipment), the West German Didifer-Werke AG (catalysts for catching noxious discharges) and the Mitra Solartechnik GmbH (solar-cell collectors), and the American General Electric (gas turbines), a spokesman for the scientific and technical centre, set up at the exhibition by the USSR Ministry of Power Development and Electrification, told TASS.

For their part, a number of foreign companies, including the American Chem Share, took interest in the development efforts of the Soviet-West-German-British enterprise Novoimpex in the field of training facilities and automated control systems for thermal power stations.

Firms from the West German province of Hessen arranged a collective exhibit laying emphasis on equipment, devices and instruments for environmental protection.

Consortium To Publish Business Paper

PM0207135590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
28 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 2

[V. Romanyuk report: "'Business World' and Business People"]

[Text] The USSR Council of Ministers has adopted a decision on setting up a newspaper publishing consortium, "Business World."

The aim of the consortium is to organize the publication and editing of the daily newspaper DELOVOY MIR, as well as several supplements, in order to shape public opinion in the country in favor of a regulated market economy and to create the practical preconditions for the transition to new economic management conditions. The USSR Council of Ministers supported the proposals of the main founders—the USSR Finance Ministry, USSR State Committee for Material and Technical Supply, the "Gazprom" concern, the "AvtoVAZ" Association, the "Tekhnokhim" MGO [expansion unknown], and a number of commercial banks—which have decided to combine monetary resources and other property on the basis of new principles, envisaging that contributions by state administration bodies to the share fund will be made by saving on resources allocated to them for development purposes.

The nature of the consortium's activity will not be commercial as a whole. However, enterprises founded by it will have the right to engage in commercial activity. Moreover, the consortium has been given the right to set up its enterprises and organizations in Soviet territory, as well as subsidiaries, departments, missions, and correspondents' centers abroad. The consortium and its organizations may form joint enterprises and international associations with foreign firms: under the procedure and on the terms stipulated by legislation for state enterprises.

The statute of the "Business World" newspaper publishing consortium indicates that new Soviet and foreign organizations may join it on the basis of bilateral agreements. But it points out that, as a rule, the commercial result cannot be the purpose of joining the consortium.

The latest issue of the all-Union daily newspaper DELOVOY MIR is in front of me. Using European standards, it is a column narrower than our central newspapers. It has eight pages, two of which are devoted to advertisements, without which a business newspaper could not survive. The front page carries a photograph: a dynamic portrait of the new chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet, B. Yeltsin. The issue contains articles by Academician L. Abalkin and publicist Yu. Chernichenko, as well as a whole page devoted to analytical material: "Oil: The Commodity and the Problem" and a hard-hitting commentary "On Currency Congestion and Business Reputation."

"But there is more to the consortium than the newspaper DELOVOY MIR?" This was our first question to M. Rostarchuk, first deputy chairman of the consortium and first deputy chief editor of the newspaper.

"Of course. Although the newspaper is its core. Having started with a print run of 500,000 copies, we hope to increase it to 1.5 million. The newspaper is already forming a 'train' of supplements with print runs of approximately 100,000 copies each. We are publishing the weekly 16-page RYNOK, based on the NEDELYA format, in conjunction with the USSR State Committee for Material and Technical Supply. The same format will be used for the weekly RADIKAL, into which the All-Union 'Znaniye' Society's publication NTR-TRIBUNA is being transformed. This publication will be the mouthpiece of the country's scientific community. Moreover, the consortium will offer its readers AVTO-REVVU, a publication for people working in the motor vehicle industry, professional rally and racing drivers, and motor enthusiasts. It is planned to begin publishing the weekly BANK for financiers. Unlike other publications in this field already familiar to the reader, we will obtain information from our founders, from first-hand sources, so to speak. For example, our founders include the USSR State Committee for Statistics, which, frankly speaking, has unique information at its disposal."

"But where do you intend to obtain such quantities of paper, given the present shortages? And printing capacities are overloaded. This issue, incidentally, was printed... in Lipetsk, not Moscow.. What is going to happen when the newspaper is published daily?"

"We will be starting operation on 1 January 1991. And I must make it clear straightaway that we have no intention of requesting a single kilogram of paper from the state or occupying a single meter of space in state printing houses. We will be creating our entire paper and printing base ourselves. We have strong foreign partners who are investing large resources in our enterprise. We intend to modernize and reequip one of the pulp and paper combines. We plan to build a new printing house furnished with modern equipment to enable us to print in color. All in all, the consortium hopes to give a boost to the development of the country's printing and paper industries through its enterprising work."

"The masthead of this issue says: 'All-Union daily newspaper.' But what is its orientation, however?"

"Our publication is independent and will only be concerned with politics to the extent necessary for the economy. We are closely cooperating, incidentally, with the USSR Council of Ministers State Commission for Economic Reform and with the 'Reforma' Socioeconomic Foundation. We would like to ask Academician L. Abalkin to head our editorial council. In principle, we see ourselves as the herald of the independent press."

So, the birth of a new newspaper publishing and intermediary-information consortium involving government, production, banking, and social organizations has become reality. In its advertising brochures the newspaper DELOVOY MIR promises its readers a broad range of advertising, information, intermediary, and commercial services.

United States & Canada

U.S. Intelligence Agency Opposed to Cable Link

PM0207094590 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 28 Jun 90 Second Edition p 3

[Article by N. Yuryev: "The Cable Hurdle. Why U.S. Signals Intelligence Is at War With the 'U.S. West' Firm"]

[Text] The National Security Agency [NSA]—the leading U.S. signals intelligence organ—has expressed its categorical opposition to the U.S. firm "U.S. West" concluding a contract worth around \$500 million to lay down across USSR territory fiber-optic cable linking West Europe with countries of the Pacific region. The laying of this cable is part of an international project that will enable the world community to create a closed worldwide communication network and to substantially extend telephone, telegraph, and facsimile communications and computer data between these regions. It was also proposed that the cable should be partly used to improve internal links in our country, particularly in the Siberian and Far East regions.

In what way does the laying of this cable on our territory infringe on the interests of U.S. national security and why is NSA interfering so grossly in the affairs of the "U.S. West" firm?

The fiber-optic cable, which makes it possible to transmit huge volumes of information, has a real disadvantage from NSA's viewpoint: It is almost impossible to intercept information from it. NSA is worried that after this cable is laid and part of USSR radio communications that are intercepted today with the help of spy satellites are transferred into it, U.S. signals intelligence will be deprived of the possibility of listening to Soviet military communications.

It emerges from data published about NSA's activity that the agency's reference to losing the possibility of checking Soviet military communications is one of its usual tricks. According to Western experts, most of "the priceless crop of information" that U.S. electronic reconnaissance gathers from Soviet communications links is not military, but commercial information. As is well known to NSA, USSR military communications have long been reliably protected from interception and there is no need to "hide" these communications any further in fiber-optic cable. Soviet commercial communications, which are not protected from interception at present, are another matter.

Commercial information is of constant great interest to the U.S. special services, as is confirmed by the case, already mentioned in our press, of the discovery of a U.S. listening unit worth \$20 million on a Soviet submarine cable in the Sea of Okhotsk. And several of these units have been found in our submarine cables. According to Soviet specialists' assessments, the round-the-clock monitoring of just one commercial channel on

this cable costs the American taxpayer approximately \$1 million annually. The overall cost of the "commercial crop" is a huge sum even by U.S. standards. With reference to foreign press reports about NSA's annual budget, which is about \$15 billion, it is enough to mention the dozen or so spy satellites worth around \$300-500 million each that constantly monitor USSR territory and the hundreds of millions of dollars allocated in the past few years for the modernization of U.S. stations all over the world that are involved in signals intelligence reconnaissance against our country.

U.S. intelligence service spokesmen believe that such large expenditure is more than compensated by the interception of Soviet commercial communications. Careful analysis of the intercepted commercial information enables NSA to obtain various information about the economic situation in our country, including "weak points" and the economy's dependence on Western technology, avenues of perestroika in the national economy, production sharing between enterprises, the nature of the work they perform, scientific research and experimental-design work, and progress in the development and testing of new arms systems. The U.S. press has mentioned, for example, that the information received by NSA about the state of our agriculture has been used successfully by the American side when relevant talks were held about the sale of grain to the USSR.

When the fiber-optic cable is laid on our country's territory, NSA may to a certain extent also lose the monitoring of the commercial communications between West Europe and the Pacific Basin countries, which is now being carried out mainly through satellite communication channels accessible to NSA.

Whether the "U.S. West" firm manages to keep at bay the pressure exerted upon it and obtain an advantageous contract to lay the cable, which would interest many countries in the world, or whether its competitors will exploit this, only time will tell.

'Chill' Seen in Bush-Mandela White House Talks

PM0207133390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
28 Jun 90 First Edition p 7

[Dispatch by Vitaliy Gan under the rubric "Correspondents Comment": "Tangible Chill. White House Meeting of U.S. President Bush and Nelson Mandela"]

[Text] Washington, 27 Jun—Mandela's arrival was marked by a ceremony on the White House lawn during which there was an exchange of speeches. It is quite likely that the contents of the speeches gave journalists grounds for speaking of the "unusual nature" of this visit. The public statements of the host and his guest revealed almost at once the disagreements between the two sides in their approaches to the RSA [Republic of South Africa] regime.

Whereas the U.S. President called on the black majority of that country to abandon the armed struggle against the

Pretoria racists, Mandela defended it as the legitimate right of a desperate people. "When a government decides to ban the political organizations of the oppressed, steps up repression, and permits no free political activity, however peaceful and nonviolent it may be, then people are left with no alternative but to resort to violence," he declared under the plainly displeased eye of Bush. "As soon as the government removes all obstacles to the holding of talks, we will consider the question of ending the armed struggle," Mandela added.

As senior administration spokesmen, who asked not to be named, reported later, during the official exchange of opinions, which lasted three hours, its participants stood "by their own interests." Mandela gave no pledges on the question of the armed struggle, while Bush remained ready to begin discussions with the U.S. Congress with regard to easing U.S. economic sanctions if Pretoria lifts the state of emergency.

It should be remembered that in 1986, after long procrastination, Washington was, all the same, forced to impose these sanctions. The U.S. Congress rejected then President Reagan's veto and adopted a law permitting their lifting only if the RSA regime fulfills a number of conditions, including the release of all political prisoners.

While coming out in support of the black majority in the RSA, at the same time the present administration is seeking an opportunity to give F. de Klerk, the country's president, assistance in return for the "flexibility" displayed by him. For the sake of objectivity, it must be said that, although de Klerk's so-called initiatives are widely regarded as cosmetic or, at best, as an attempt to gain time, they have nonetheless led to the legalization of the African National Congress of South Africa and the release of Mandela after 27 years in jail. However, things have not yet gone further than this, but Washington, which has always taken a rather ambiguous stand with regard to Pretoria, hastened to seize on the regime's "new approach." I do not think that the administration has abandoned its search for a "reward" for the RSA president, particularly as there is quite a strong stratum of legislators in the U.S. Congress who support the White House in this. Even if the law itself is not revised, there are other options. Such as, for example, encouraging U.S. private business to invest in the RSA....

In other words, the official part of Mandela's U.S. tour—earlier he visited New York and Boston, where hundreds of thousands of Americans gave him a touchingly emotional welcome—has begun, you might say, with a quite tangible chill.

U.S.-Soviet Citizens Diplomacy Conference Cited

LD0307065990 Moscow TASS in English 0627 GMT
3 Jun 90

[1990 Special to TASS by Anne Leslie Rocuelli]

[Text] New York July 3—The Chautauqua citizens diplomacy process, an annual U.S.-Soviet program, will undergo a change in leadership as well as a change in approach before the 1990 conference, which will take place in the Soviet Union from October 20 through November 4.

The American Center for International Leadership (ACIL), a Maryland-based organization specializing in providing international leadership training for emerging American leaders announced that it would take over responsibility for the program, but only if it would be able to revamp its agenda and approach.

According to Stephen Hayes, president of ACIL, the approach taken will be similar to what has been used in the emerging leaders summit process. The summit, held last week, brought together more than 400 U.S. and Soviet experts in 17 fields for a week of topical dialogue in Sochi.

This differs from the way the Chautauqua program operated in its first five years. Run by the Chautauqua Institute of New York State, the conference consisted of an official delegation of experts and a much larger unofficial delegation made up of any ordinary citizen willing to pay. The talks were therefore restricted to a general overview of issues, as opposed to an exchange of knowledge between professionals.

"While relations were strained between the two nations, it was necessary to have this type of format," Hayes said in a TASS interview.

In the spirit of glasnost, ACIL would like to make the conference more productive by eliminating this unofficial delegation and having only experts convene.

"In this way we can develop a dialogue and maybe come to some agreements on programs to implement," Hayes said.

The Chautauqua Institute gave up the program because it no longer saw a need for such conferences, according to Dr. Dan Bratton, president of the institute.

"The conferences began at a precarious time in U.S.-Soviet relations," Bratton said in a TASS interview. "But now that those relations have changed, our conferences changed. We knew going into the 1989 conference that it would probably be our last." They suggested to ACIL that they should carry on with the work of the conference. ACIL accepted, but only for one year...so far.

This fall, about 200 experts from each side will be recruited for 18 issue-specific commissions, with topics including ecological security, health care, the space race, and military matters.

"There are things of enormous importance for our two countries to discuss as we ease into the post-cold war era," Hayes said. "The ACIL delegation will reflect that

level of importance." The program will continue to be called the Chautauqua Conference, a name Bratton says is no longer fitting.

"If it eliminates the citizens component, it is not a Chautauqua conference," he said. "It was never supposed to be a think tank."

China

Further on Emigration of China's Fang Lizhi

PM0207163390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
29 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 5

[Dispatch by Yu. Savenkov: "The Fang Lizhi Affair. Dissident Scientist Leaves China"]

[Text] Beijing—It was already reported that China's public security organs have given astrophysicist Fang Lizhi, the best-known Chinese political dissident, and his wife Li Shuxian, a Beijing University lecturer, permission to emigrate.

Last June Professor Fang Lizhi and his wife appealed to the U.S. Embassy in Beijing to "safeguard their security." Meanwhile the Chinese authorities issued a warrant for their arrest on a charge of "counterrevolutionary propaganda and incitement to riot" during last year's student disturbances.

The Chinese couple flew on a USAF transport to London with British visas. They will now spend six months in Britain. According to a statement by officials in London, their visas may be extended, but they could also go where they want—even back to China.

Analysts in Beijing believe that this step removes one of the obstacles in the way of normalizing Sino-U.S. relations, which were exacerbated after the dramatic events in Beijing in the spring and summer of last year.

The Hong Kong newspaper SOUTH CHINA MORNING POST reports that Fang Lizhi issued a three-point statement:

1. He opposes the four basic principles enshrined in the Chinese Constitution (adherence to the socialist road, leadership by the Communist Party, democratic dictatorship of the people, and Marxism-Leninism and Mao Zedong Thought) since, in his view, they are aimed at asserting the political system of "class struggle."
2. He is leaving China to visit friends and relatives abroad and for medical treatment.
3. He will be concentrating on scientific work and will not take part in opposition activity.

Fang also stressed that he and his wife will welcome activity in line with Chinese society's interests and do not intend to take part in any movement based on motives hostile to China.

Observers drew attention to the fact that the XINHUA report on the emigration permission for the couple makes no mention of the charge of "counterrevolutionary activity and incitement" against them. Diplomatic circles in Beijing think that this gesture by the Chinese Government is linked with the forthcoming debates in the U.S. Congress on granting most-favored-nation status to China, as well as with the fact that a summit of the big seven leading industrial countries will be held in Houston in July and may discuss the renewal of credit to China from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and other leading banks.

At the same time, Li Peng, premier of the PRC State Council, meeting with an FRG parliamentary delegation a few days ago, stated that the Chinese Government's more lenient policy toward participants in last year's unrest is not a result of Western pressure but merely reflects the growing political and economic stability in the country.

Solidarity Meeting With Chinese Group Continues

PM0207164390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
29 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Strengthening Relations"]

[Text] Soviet people were always pained by the cool relations between the USSR and the PRC in recent history. Conversely, there is now universal approval for the measures taken by our country's leadership to actively organize cooperation in all spheres with our great Chinese neighbor and ally in the struggle for socialism. This was stated during a 28 June discussion between R.N. Nishanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet of Nationalities, and a delegation from the Chinese People's Association for Friendship With Foreign Countries. It is in the USSR at the invitation of the Soviet Committee for Solidarity With Asian and African Countries.

Soviet-Chinese contacts have particularly grown in all areas, not least parliamentary contacts, following reciprocal summit-level visits to the USSR and the PRC. They are acquiring new quality—for instance, there has been an unprecedented growth in contacts between China and our union republics, particularly the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] and Kazakhstan. The participants in the conversation stressed the immense role played in the further strengthening and development of ties by the people of the two countries, who—even at the most unfavorable times for Soviet-Chinese relations—have striven to rise above political circumstances and be guided by common human values. The guests provided information on the goals and tasks of the Chinese People's Association for Friendship With Foreign Countries and its activity in deepening ties with the public of various states. In this respect it was noted that friendly relations with Soviet colleagues is of particular importance.

The Chinese delegation showed particular interest in perestroika, the way in which the processes of renewing all aspects of Soviet society's life are proceeding, the difficulties encountered along the way, and the ways in which it is planned to overcome them.

The chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities talked about the work of the Soviet parliament's third session and about the adoption of acts of legislation connected with the implementation of political and socioeconomic reform, the development of glasnost and democratization, and the improvement of the system of national state building, and set out the fundamental approaches toward the elaboration of a new union treaty.

Yu Hongliang, PRC ambassador to the USSR, took part in the talks.

Northeast Asia

Gorbachev To Make First Leader's Visit to Japan

90UF0267A Moscow *RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA*
in Russian 23 Jun 90 p 3

[Aleksandr Kiselev comment: "Breaking the Vicious Circle"]

[Text] Addressing activists of the ruling Liberal Democratic Party in Atami, Japanese Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu recently announced that USSR President M.S. Gorbachev would visit Japan at the start of next year. This announcement has elicited active comment in the world news media. After all, not one top leader of the USSR has visited this country in the whole history of Soviet-Japanese relations.

The Soviet side has in recent years been making vigorous efforts to stimulate political dialogue with Japan. Last year alone the two countries' foreign ministers met four times. Parliamentary contacts are being made. At the start of this year the Soviet Union was at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee visited for the first time by a delegation of Japan's ruling Liberal Democratic Party headed by a prominent figure in it, S. Abe, who was received by M.S. Gorbachev. In the process of the political dialogue the idea of our aspiration to the utmost expansion of economic cooperation with Japan has been unambiguously conveyed to our Japanese partners. Today Japan is our most important partner in Pacific Asia and third among the developed capitalist states.

However, on each occasion the actual discussion concerning a stimulation of trade and economic relations, in which Japanese industrial circles are interested also, has come up against the unsettled state of the so-called territorial problem. It is a question, I would recall, of Tokyo's claims to four islands of our Kuril chain—Iturup, Kunashir, Habomai, and Shikotan. The roots of these disagreements reside in our relations' past. The peoples of our two countries are now hostage to this past, and the territorial problem is serving as an insurmountable obstacle to mutually profitable cooperation.

The political dialogue which is under way has revealed one obvious truth: There has to be mutual compromise on the territorial issue. An energetic quest for this compromise is far more sensible and useful than inaction leading to political deadlock. By its readiness for compromise the Soviet side has recently shown its sincere aspiration to break the vicious circle which is being created by the figures of the Japanese administration who are insisting, as before, on pursuit of a policy of "nonseparation of politics from economics." It is an essentially a question of Japan's linkage of the development of bilateral relations with the USSR with satisfaction of its territorial claims on our country.

And the attempts to dramatize the situation concerning the "northern territories" by way of imparting an "international" nature to the bilateral Japanese-Soviet dispute will hardly facilitate the search for compromise. But such attempts are being made. Addressing a meeting of the special commission for Okinawa and the "northern territories" of the lower house of the Japanese parliament recently, Japanese Foreign Minister T. Nakayama promised to appeal to Western countries for assistance in a settlement of the territorial disagreements with the USSR. The head of Japan's foreign policy department even indicated where he intended doing this: at the upcoming meeting this July in Houston (United States) of the heads of state and government of the seven developed capitalist countries. I believe, however, that the intention of putting such pressure on the USSR represents a step away from a search for a basis for compromise in bilateral relations.

There is still time left before the USSR president's scheduled visit to Tokyo. I would like to believe that the persons responsible for formulation of our two countries' foreign policy course will still manage to overcome the burden of the past, cast aside opportunist political considerations, and create practicable prerequisites for moving Soviet-Japanese relations onto the highway of all-around and productive cooperation.

Northern Islands Trusteeship With Japan Proposed

OW0207035390 Tokyo *KYODO* in English 0003 GMT
2 Jul 90

[Text] Moscow, July 1 *KYODO*—A leading Soviet commentator on Japan has proposed that the string of small Pacific islands held by the Soviet Union and claimed by Japan be put under United Nations trusteeship and incorporated in a special economic zone owned by the two countries.

Vsevolod Ovchinnikov, a political commentator for the Communist Party newspaper *PRAVDA*, made the proposal in the paper's Sunday edition.

Similar proposals have been discussed among Soviet scholars but this is the first time a *PRAVDA* commentator forwarded such a plan in the ruling party's daily.

The islands—Kunashiri, Etorofu, Shikotan, and the Habomai group—located off Hokkaido, have been held by the Soviet Union since the end of World War II.

Japan has said it will not sign a peace treaty with Moscow until the islands are returned.

Ovchinnikov said the two countries could also discuss other variants that would be mutually acceptable.

But it would not be wise for Japan to expect unilateral concessions from the Soviet Union on the return of the islands, he said.

South Korean President's Aide Interviewed

PM0207120590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
30 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 5

[Interview in Moscow with Kim Un-yong, personal representative of South Korean President No Tae-u, by IZVESTIYA correspondent Yevgeniy Bay under the rubric: "IZVESTIYA Interview"; date unspecified; "From First Contacts To Diplomatic Relations"—first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] In South Korea Kim Un-yong is famous both as a sports leader (he is a member of the International Olympic Committee Executive Committee and chairman of the national taekwondo federation) and as a prominent politician. He has just completed a trip to a number of East European countries as the personal representative of President No Tae-u. Kim Un-yong is now in Moscow at the invitation of the USSR Academy of Sciences' Economics of the World Socialist System Institute. IZVESTIYA's correspondent met with him on the eve of his return to Seoul.

[Bay] How are South Korea's political and economic ties with the East European states developing?

[Kim] I visited Hungary, Yugoslavia, and Poland—which have established diplomatic relations with us—and met with those states' presidents. We signed a whole series of agreements with the Hungarian Government, allocated it large credit lines, and agreed on several joint projects. An increasing number of South Korean firms have started cooperating with the Hungarians. We are also expecting proposals from other East European countries on a number of projects which we could finance. The level of cooperation will naturally depend on those states' ability to make effective progress toward a market economy.

[Bay] What position does the Soviet Union occupy in those plans?

[Kim] A priority position. There was an enormous response in South Korea to the recent meeting between Soviet and South Korean Presidents M. Gorbachev and No Tae-u. This was a step toward mutual rapprochement and it was of historic importance. Our contacts, which

started with the Seoul Olympics, are being fleshed out. The position adopted by the Soviet leadership deserves the greatest respect.

[Bay] The meeting also discussed questions of economic cooperation. It is well known that certain prominent South Korean businessmen are prepared to invest large amounts of capital in the Soviet economy, and that talks are under way about projects in Siberia and Maritime Kray....

[Kim] The USSR is only just switching to a market economy, whereas we have slightly more experience in this area. We are a small country, but we are the 10th largest foreign trader in the world. The Soviet Union has colossal resources, but South Korea is not only interested in obtaining raw materials. We also need advanced Soviet technology, which we could use in our market economy. There are already examples of cooperation, but an effective trading system can only be achieved when diplomatic relations are established. These will provide guarantees for South Korean investors, prevent dual taxation, and resolve the question of the repatriation of profits. After all, the prospects for cooperation are very varied—from the laying of a gas pipeline from Yakutia to South Korea to the construction of joint enterprises at which we will produce computers, televisions, clothing, and footwear.

And I would like to stress that the establishment of diplomatic relations is not an item of trade for us. They will be the basis for effective and mutually advantageous economic relations, but for us it is no less important that the establishment of official contacts between Moscow and Seoul will be an important factor in stabilizing the situation in Northeast Asia and in strengthening peace and mutual confidence throughout the Asia-Pacific region.

[Bay] I have repeatedly heard the opinion expressed that by strengthening contacts with the USSR, South Korea has an eye above all to the mediating role that Moscow could play on the Korean peninsula.

[Kim] The unification of the two states is primarily our problem, and it should primarily be resolved through talks between Seoul and Pyongyang. Mid-level contacts have now begun to all intents and purposes. President No Tae-u, insofar as I am aware, has proposed meeting with the North Korean leader and is prepared to travel to Pyongyang. We want to help our brothers economically, and they—judging by everything—might accept our help. At the same time, South Korea is interested in conducting talks in the most varied areas—interparliamentary contacts, the Red Cross, and exchanges of military and sports delegations. Our country's entire policy is aimed at achieving reconciliation. And if Seoul makes these active efforts we are entitled to expect help from the USSR, the United States, and Japan. The world has become exceedingly interconnected. What is happening on the Korean Peninsula cannot fail to influence to some extent the Soviet Union,

which is not only a European country but an Asian country too. Equally, the democratic changes in the USSR and the other East European countries are having a positive impact on the situation on the Korean peninsula.

DPRK Navy Delegation Visits Primorskiy Kray

SK0107034290 Moscow International Service
in Korean 0900 GMT 28 Jun 90

[Report from the "Primorskiy Kray" program]

[Text] A visit to Primorskiy Kray by oceanographers of the Korean People's Army led by Real Admiral Choe Chun-kil has ended.

They acquainted themselves with the work of the hydrologists of the Pacific Fleet and discussed the matter of improving the skill of weather forecasting, a new method of developing the (?deep sea), and the question of using equipment.

The Korean guests laid a wreath before the memorial of the Pacific Fleet's glory of battle and observed a moment's silence in memory of the Soviet soldiers who fell in the course of liberating the Korean peninsula from the Japanese occupiers.

The Korean guests also visited the Primorskiy Kray chapter of the Soviet Association of Geography and saw rare maps of the past and various precious materials which [words indistinct] of this chapter. The chapter presented the guests with a rare atlas.

Captain (Sokhovorov) said: Our relations have constantly expanded. For example, last year we jointly conducted a hydrogeographical research and agreed to establish a [words indistinct] navigation system to guarantee safety in navigation in the East Sea of Korea.

DPRK Leaders Send Thanks to Gorbachev, Ryzhkov

PM0207163790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
29 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Gratitude for Congratulations"]

[Text] DPRK President Kim Il-song has passed on to USSR President M.S. Gorbachev, via the Soviet Embassy in Pyongyang, profound gratitude for the congratulations in connection with his reelection to this post. Kim Il-song expressed confidence in the further strengthening of the traditional relations of friendship and cooperation between the parties, countries, and peoples of the USSR and the DPRK.

Gratitude for congratulations was also conveyed to N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, from Yon Hyong-muk, who was reelected chairman of the DPRK Administration Council.

Greetings to DPRK Mark Month of Solidarity

90UF0266A Moscow TRUD in Russian 24 Jun 90 p 1

[TASS report: "Display of Solidarity"]

[Text] The AUCCTU [All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions] has sent to the Korean Joint Trade Unions Central Committee in Pyongyang greetings in connection with the staging in the Soviet Union of a month of solidarity with the Korean people's struggle for the withdrawal of foreign forces from South Korea and the country's unification on a peaceful democratic basis. It emphasizes that the Soviet working people and their unions have always been in sympathy with the efforts of the Korean nation to achieve a political settlement in Korea and the development of the wide-ranging constructive dialogue of North and South. We consistently advocate, the document says, detente on the Korean peninsula, the consolidation of peace and stability in the Far East and Asia as a whole, and the establishment of mutually profitable cooperation between countries of the Asia-Pacific region.

DPRK Light Industry Delegation Visits Crimea

SK3006091590 Moscow International Service
in Korean 1330 GMT 25 Jun 90

[Text] A DPRK light industry delegation led by Kim Pyong-hwan, manager of the Kumgang plant, has made a one-week visit to the Crimean peninsula on the Black Sea. The guests visited Simferopol and Yevpatoriya and observed the work of a clothing enterprise with which they maintain friendly relations. This is the leading enterprise of the Yevpatoriya clothing plant workers, who have been cooperating with the Sariwon (Unha) complex for over three years, and of the Simferopol (?Crimea) clothing complex of the (Krupska) union body, which also cooperates with Korean clothing enterprises.

During its visit, the delegation reached a trade agreement for 1991, and it agreed to found a joint center for the development of [word indistinct] and clothing patterns as part of a DPRK and Soviet government-to-government accord to produce light industrial goods until the year 2000.

Kim Pyong-hwan, who led the Korean delegation, said that the visit to (?Crimea) by the DPRK dressmakers further strengthened working relations with their Soviet colleagues and that members of the delegation had obtained considerable benefits from the enterprise.

Cooperation between the DPRK and the Soviet light industrial functionaries is a good example of fraternal cooperation. The developing cooperation between the garment makers of the two countries these days is a form of the mutually beneficial economic cooperation between the light industrial enterprises of the DPRK and the Soviet Union.

Mr. Valeriy Sereka, leader of the Yevpatoriya clothing plant, in an interview with our station reporter, noted that the functionaries of the (?Crimean) enterprise, in accordance with a contract, provide their Korean colleagues with raw materials, other materials, [words indistinct] for the production of garments, as well as technological papers and patterns for the (?20 kinds) of samples of clothes.

This year, the Korean friends will produce some 1 million pieces of clothes carrying the (Unha) trademark for Soviet plants. Then these goods will be returned to (?Crimea) to be sold.

The Yevpatoriya plant has recently become a member of the Soviet Chamber of Commerce and Industry. This will enable the plant to participate in international trade fairs and to sign contracts with many countries on its own. This enterprise completed modernization and received many sewing machines from Japan, the FRG, and other countries. This makes it possible for the enterprise to increase the kinds of goods it produces and to sell high-quality finished goods to Western markets as well as local markets.

Mr. Valeriy Sereka (?sent greetings) to the delegations of the (Unha) enterprise and the Kungang plant, saying that he hoped cooperation between his enterprise and the Korean friends would be further strengthened and (?developed). He also wished them new successes in production and construction and expressed solidarity in the Korean people's struggle for the peaceful reunification of the country (?by democratic means).

Near East & South Asia

Foreign Ministry Statement on Jewish Settlement

LD0207135890 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1300 GMT 2 Jul 90

[Text] Moscow, 2 Jul (TASS)—A statement by the USSR Foreign Ministry representative has been officially distributed here. It says:

Public statements have recently been made in Israel proposing that staff from the USSR Foreign Ministry consular group in Tel Aviv should visit Jewish settlements in the West Bank of the River Jordan and in the Gaza strip and satisfy themselves that there is no mass settling of immigrants arriving there from the Soviet Union.

We note Israel's agreement with the principle of verifying the situation as regards settling immigrants in the occupied territories. At the same time, since what is at issue is a matter connected with observance of the provisions of international documents—the 4th Geneva Convention of 1949 and corresponding UN decisions—and also bearing in mind that immigrants are coming to Israel not only from the USSR but from other countries too, there would be justification for conducting such verification on a collective basis within the framework of

the UN. Of course, this verification cannot be seen as giving any grounds whatsoever for recognizing de facto occupied territories as Israeli. In this event the Soviet Union would be prepared to be involved in implementing the proposal on verification.

Pretext for Ending PLO Dialogue 'Contrived'

PM0207134190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
25 Jun 90 Second Edition pp 1, 6

[Dispatch by Vitaliy Gan under the rubric: "Correspondent Comments": "'Other Shoe Has Been Kicked Off'—United States Breaks Off Dialogue With the PLO"]

[Text] Washington, 24 Jun—The so-called Near East "peace process" which the Americans undertook to implement has apparently finally reached deadlock. President G. Bush has announced that the United States is breaking off dialogue with the PLO.

The official pretext for ending discussions of 18 months standing with the Palestinians appears manifestly contrived. Three weeks ago, as was reported, a Palestinian faction carried out a raid on the Israeli coast. "We gave the PLO plenty of time to investigate this incident," the President stated. "However, the PLO have still not offered a plausible account of it." G. Bush invited PLO Executive Committee Chairman Yasir 'Arafat not simply to condemn this attack but also to punish those responsible for it. In his words, the United States' contacts with the Palestinians were highly valued, and the White House is ready to renew them as soon as the PLO is prepared to "take the necessary steps."

In this way the U.S. side, as they express it over here, has "kicked off the other shoe." The first shoe was the rather sharp condemnation of the new Israeli government for virtually sabotaging Washington's intermediary role by toughening the conditions for holding peace talks with the Palestinians. As already reported, in his speech to Congress, Secretary of State J. Baker accused the Shamir government of being unwilling to hold serious peace talks.

It is possible to surmise that the White House's decision to break off the U.S.-Palestinian dialogue is some kind of balancing act. In the light of the storm of protest from the U.S. Israeli lobby which the demarche toward Tel Aviv has provoked, any U.S. politician, let alone the President, would be forced to somehow "balance" his standpoint—the influence here of Israel's friends has long since entered into legend. Although Bush has denied that he took this measure to avoid the impression that he was "soft" toward the PLO, and "tough" vis-a-vis Israel, the President himself admitted that this is exactly how many interpret his actions.

As reported from Tel Aviv, the President's announcement provoked applause. The official Palestinian reaction was naturally completely different. "President Bush is rewarding the terrorists who were in fact seeking to

disrupt the process of political settlement," a representative of the National Council of Palestine stated. The assessment is correct but, I think, somewhat one-sided. In breaking off dialogue with the Palestinians, the United States is thereby essentially rewarding also the Shamir government's opposition to the search for peace in the Near East.

It is perfectly obvious that today's announcement by President Bush heralds if not the end, then at least a pause with unforeseeable consequences in the efforts to bring the Israelis and Palestinians to the negotiating table. Now, perhaps, everyone is convinced that without the PLO there can be no progress toward a peaceful political settlement of this most dangerous regional conflict. And unless problems between Palestinians and Israelis are resolved, then the Near East will again find itself on the brink of war.

Afghanistan's Najibullah on Reconciliation Policy

*PM0207153190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
25 Jun 90 Second Edition pp 1, 6*

[Report by PRAVDA correspondent V. Plastun on interview with Afghan President Najibullah under the rubric: "Our Interview"; date and place not specified: "Afghanistan: Road to Reconciliation"]

[Text] Important events are taking place in the life of Afghanistan's people. A Loya Jirga (the supreme meeting of representatives of the country's nationalities and ethnic groups) has been held. The People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan [PDPA] Congress opens any day now. In this connection V. Plastun, PRAVDA's own correspondent in Kabul, held an interview with Afghan President Najibullah, general secretary of the PDPA Central Committee, in which he gave his assessment of the current situation.

According to the president, the Loya Jirga has made the necessary amendments to the Basic Law of the Republic of Afghanistan and has thereby opened the way for deepening the process of national reconciliation and expanding democracy in the country.

The amendments to Article 1 of the Constitution include a clause on the Islamic character of the Afghan state. The PDPA's privileged position, hitherto contained in the preamble of the constitution, has now been deleted from the text and political pluralism has been adopted as the basis of the political system.

General principles stipulating equal, free, secret, and direct suffrage have been defined for the holding of elections.

The sphere of activity of the private sector in the economy and in social life is virtually unlimited, and the state's monopoly or control in this sphere has been either completely revoked or significantly reduced, Najibullah noted.

The Loya Jirga ratified the new mechanism proposed by the government for the peaceful settlement of the Afghan problem. A resolution and a number of appeals to Afghan emigres, the commanders of armed detachments of the internal opposition, the Islamic Conference Organization, and the United Nations secretary general were adopted.

Over the last three years the policy of national reconciliation, as the only alternative to war, has yielded great results which may make the road to a political solution of the Afghan problem easier, the Afghan president stated. Assessing the results achieved and the current approach in the face of the future, we give the course of national reconciliation a positive assessment and we look to the future with optimism.

Making a high assessment of the results of the meeting of the U.S. and Soviet presidents, Najibullah noted that conversations on the problem of Afghanistan were also held during the talks. The two sides came to the conclusion that the way to solve it is the road of dialogue, talks, and preparations for holding free elections monitored by the international community. We consider these conclusions to be a positive step and a useful achievement on the road to a solution of the Afghan problem.

As for the opposition, in the Afghan leader's opinion, it represents a wide spectrum of political parties, alliances, forces, and individual personalities. As a result its approaches to the problems of war and peace vary. Now many local commanders have come to understand the need to end the war and establish peace in the country. It is for this reason that some of them have reached agreement with the government. Talks are being held and contacts maintained with the others. Aspirations for a negotiated political solution are also growing among some leaders and activists of Afghan associations abroad. And only a small number of association leaders and local commanders are continuing the war and rejecting reconciliation. There are two reasons for this. One lies in the fact that their personal interests are tied to the continuation of the war. War for them is profitable. They see no future for themselves in a peaceful Afghanistan. The other reason is the pressure exerted on the extremists by some foreign circles, especially by Pakistan's military intelligence organs, to make them continue the war.

With regard to the upcoming PDPA Congress, Najibullah said that it will ratify the organization's new program and statutes and also define methods of renewal and perestroika in the party.

Afghan PDPA Renounces Monopoly on Power

*PM0207155790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
28 Jun 90 Second Edition p 6*

[TASS report: "Congress Opened"]

[Text] Kabul, 27 Jun—The Second PDPA [People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan] Congress opened here

today. Najibullah, general secretary of the PDPA Central Committee, delivered the political report. He pointed out that the party has covered a complex path of ups and downs in its more than quarter-century history.

The revolutionary radicalism that influenced the party's activity resulted in its face being presented in a distorted form. This enabled some people to put the red stamp of communism on the party. Haste, the desire to skip natural stages of socioeconomic development, and the underestimation of public opinion and of Afghan nationalism in the party's first program documents were striking, particularly from today's standpoint. An objective look at the past shows that the party also should have taken greater account of the role and significance of the Islamic religion than it actually did.

The PDPA's chief mistake after coming to power in 1978, Najibullah went on to say, was the fact that it increasingly antagonized active and influential allies. In addition, old factional contradictions flared up with new force.

A principled approach was not taken to the question of war and peace either. The war, to which the brakes could have been applied in the initial stages, continued with the very worst manifestations.

A tense situation was created in the country, a characteristic feature of which was the armed confrontation and the full-scale war between the new power on the one hand and the opposition forces on the other. These factors, in addition to certain other causes of a geopolitical nature, created the conditions under which Soviet troops entered Afghanistan. Even leaving aside the question of the circumstances of the adoption of the decision to send Soviet troops into Afghanistan—history will pass judgment on this—the events of the past 12 years undoubtedly attest that the sending in of troops did not meet Afghanistan's national interests.

From the congress rostrum, Najibullah said, I wish to express gratitude to the Soviet Union's people and leadership, who, by agreement with us, rendered assistance in the matter of the Soviet troop withdrawal.

Everything positive in the PDPA's activity, Najibullah continued, could in no way compensate for the tremendous harm done by the war to the country's already weak economy. By the end of 1986 it already exceeded 500 billion afghanis. Under those conditions the party needed to make a new analysis of the situation in order to put an end to stagnation and emerge from the impasse.

An analysis of the situation's development led to the conclusion that things could not continue like this. Therefore the party adopted a qualitatively new policy and advocated national reconciliation.

At the same time the Central Committee has reached the conclusion that, in order to conform more to the conditions stemming from the policy of national reconciliation, the party needs a profound renewal of its ideological and organizational foundations. The draft of the PDPA's new program defines the tasks not of a ruling party but of a party which has abandoned its monopoly on power, relies on democratic principles of participation in state management, and has established equal and mutually advantageous relations with other parties with a view to achieving its own tasks in the present and in the future not by administrative methods but by means of political struggle.

With regard to the discrepancy between the party's program and its present name, the proposal to change the PDPA's name to the Fatherland Party appears quite in order.

The PDPA confirms the fact that a party's ideology is inseparably linked with the socioeconomic conditions in the country in which it operates. This is precisely why it would be irrational if the party, without any particular need to do so, unilaterally confined itself to the framework of a single ideology.

The PDPA is armed with a political line which creates preconditions for a joint struggle within its ranks by all patriots, peace-loving elements, democrats, and progressive forces.

The delegates gave a warm welcome to the CPSU Central Committee's greetings message to the congress.

The forum is continuing its work.

Congress Ends, Party Renamed

PM0307090390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
29 Jun 90 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Toward Expansion of Democracy"]

[Text] Kabul, 28 Jun—The second congress of the PDPA [People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan] completed its work here today, adopting a decision to rename the PDPA the Fatherland Party. Today's sessions discussed and approved the Central Committee report to the congress, the action programs, and the Fatherland Party statute and adopted decisions on a number of organizational questions. Elections were held to the party Central Council, which has been joined by 144 members and 59 candidate members. The congress delegates instructed the Central Council to prepare plans for the party's new flag and symbol.

Afghan President Najibullah was unanimously elected chairman of the Fatherland Party. Delivering the concluding speech at the congress, he noted that the congress delegates confirmed the party's desire to expand democracy, to strengthen the political system based on the multiparty system, and to create coalition organs of power centrally and locally. The congress, Najibullah said, reflected the party members' desire that their party

should promote new initiatives in this direction. The chairman of the Fatherland Party expressed the conviction that the new party will be able to become the biggest peacemaking and democratic force in the country.

East Europe

Halt on Troop Withdrawal From Hungary Threatened

LD0207173390 Budapest Domestic Service
in Hungarian 1600 GMT 2 Jul

[Text] The commander of the Soviet troops stationed in Hungary has threatened to halt the Soviet troop withdrawal, unless the Hungarian Government pays for the vacated barracks.

Burlakov gave a statement to the correspondent of 'IZVESTIYA' despatched to Hungary, and confirmed that Soviet soldiers will guard the dwelling houses and the housing estates until they are compensated. Burlakov also criticized the Soviet Government for not coming to an agreement with the Hungarian leadership so far.

More on Hungarian Plan To Leave Warsaw Pact

PM0207114590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
28 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Dispatch by IZVESTIYA correspondent F. Lukyanov: "Hungarian Parliament Resolution"]

[Text] Budapest—The Hungarian National Assembly has adopted a resolution—with 232 in favor and four abstentions—containing an appeal to the government to begin talks on Hungary's withdrawal from the Warsaw Pact and to freeze the country's participation in the pact's military organization pending the completion of the talks.

As IZVESTIYA has already reported, the proposal concerning Hungary's withdrawal from the Warsaw Pact was initially conveyed for discussion to the parliamentary commissions which were responsible for preparing the present resolution. It contains a reference to the decision taken by Imre Nagy's government on 1 November 1956, which proclaimed Hungary to be a neutral country, and indicates that military intervention on 4 November of the same year prevented this decision from being given legal force. When adopting the resolution, the National Assembly also referred to Article 62 of the Vienna Convention, which stipulates that any country's membership of an international organization may be terminated in connection with a radical change in the situation which existed at the time of signing the agreement.

The resolution also contains the proposal—in a separate clause—to review Hungary's bilateral treaties with Warsaw Pact member-countries on friendship, cooperation, and mutual assistance in order to rule out any legal entitlement, as the document puts it, to military intervention or any other violation of Hungarian sovereignty.

It stresses in this respect that the Hungarian people wish to continue living in peace and friendship with all neighboring peoples.

It must be said that different approaches to various provisions of the document were apparent during the parliamentary discussion of the resolution, although the majority of deputies stressed that all the questions raised must be resolved exclusively through negotiations, with unilateral measures being avoided. As a supplement to the text of the resolution, in their speeches a number of deputies urged the Soviet Union to admit that sending troops into Hungary in November 1956 was a mistake. However, this proposal was not put to the vote.

In connection with the changing situation, the deputies placed particular emphasis on the creation of an all-European security system and international security guarantees for the country in the new conditions and asked the government to keep the public regularly informed of its steps in this direction.

Touching on the question of withdrawing Soviet troops from Hungary in the course of the discussion, Gyorgy Balogh, chairman of the parliamentary defense commission and deputy from the Smallholders' Party, said that the Hungarian side could offer a sum in the region of 10 billion forints as compensation for property left behind by the Soviet forces. G. Horn, chairman of the foreign affairs commission, said that specific figures and amounts should not be given in advance.

Exhumation of Graves of Polish Officers To Begin

LD3006010890 Warsaw PAP in English
1538 GMT 29 Jun 90

[By PAP special reporter Waldemar Siwinski]

[Text] Kharkov, June 29—The exhumation of graves in Kharkov Forest where most probably Polish officers from the Starobelsk camp murdered by NKVD [People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs] in April and May of 1940 were buried will start on July 20. This sensational news was released today by Kharkov District Prosecutor Gennadiy Kozevnikov who told PAP that the exhumation work would probably last till August 1.

The exhumation should provide final material evidence to confirm the thesis as to which neither the prosecutor nor the head of the local KGB General Nikolay Gibdulov have got the slightest doubt. The thesis is that all or at least majority of Polish officers from Starobelsk were brought to Kharkov in April and May of 1940 and murdered on the premises or in the yard of the then NKVD headquarters in Chernyshevskiy St. and their bodies were buried in the nearby forest.

The question of the participation of Polish experts in the exhumation has not been settled yet.

Growing Rift in Poland's 'Solidarity' Noted

PM0207163190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
26 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Report by TASS correspondent V. Volkov: "Differences in 'Solidarity'"]

[Text] Warsaw—Sunday's session in Warsaw of the Citizens Committee under "Solidarity" Trade Union Chairman L. Walesa was evidence of the further political demarcation of Poland's ruling forces and differences over the future path of transformations in the country.

This public organ was created two years ago and comprised opposition political, public, and trade union figures, representatives of science and culture, and advisers to the "Solidarity" leader, many of whom have now become Sejm deputies and senators and occupy prominent posts. The founding of the committee provided the impetus for the creation of a broad movement of local citizens committees which contributed to the success of candidates connected with "Solidarity" at the elections.

Recently there has been an aggravation of the differences in the committee and in the citizens movement between supporters of L. Walesa's radical line and the more moderate, constructive course of continuing the transformations, personified by T. Mazowiecki and his government. At the session, the "Solidarity" leader had to listen to a great deal of criticism from his former colleagues and advisers over his authoritarian policy vis-a-vis the members of the Citizens Committee and strong words about the government and the Citizens Parliamentary Club. Senate Deputy Speaker A. Wielowieyski said that in recent months L. Walesa has made mistakes that endanger everyone. They have caused a sharp increase in public unrest in the country.

At the meeting supporters of L. Walesa and his radical ideas for "acceleration" contained in the "centrist forces' consensus" attacked "left-wingers" in the government, remnants of the "old nomenklatura," and the press and television for allegedly distorting their pronouncements.

A letter sent to L. Walesa by 62 members of the Citizens Committee was read out at the session. It points out that his recent decisions concerning appointments and dismissals in the committee contravened the principle of collaboration and cooperation. We believe, the document says, that the Citizens Committee has done its job and there is no need for it to continue. The movement of citizens committees started by it will be able to make its own decisions on its organizational structures and methods of activity.

To avoid a final split, the session participants accepted L. Walesa's proposal to hold yet another meeting with the same participants in a month's time.

Stasi, KGB Accused of Terrorism in GDR

PM0207163990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
28 Jun 90 Second Edition p 7

[Dispatch by Sergey Baygarov under the rubric "Correspondent Comments": "Propaganda Terror"]

[Excerpt] Berlin, 27 Jun—[passage omitted] To judge from Western press reports, secret services in the FRG knew about the presence of terrorists in the GDR as long ago as the early eighties. Let us leave aside questions of morality and pose a different, purely pragmatic question—Why did the leaders of the special services stay silent then, and why has this frankly unsavory affair surfaced right now?

The arguments of the leaders of West Germany's BND [Federal Intelligence Service] were evidently quite simple: At the time it was advantageous to have dangerous criminals removed essentially by other people's hands. But now a quite unexpected side of this fact has been turned up: People have begun accusing GDR intelligence and M. Wolf, who headed it for a long time within the structures of the Ministry of State Security, of complicity in terrorism. He resigned for political reasons several years ago. This man is now the only person who is not afraid to champion the interests of former State Security Ministry staffers, including intelligence officers.

"As regards myself personally and the former GDR intelligence apparatus, I can state unequivocally that we have nothing to do with the Red Army Faction or persons arrested on the country's territory," M. Wolf told me.

In the opinion of the retired general, this campaign merely makes it more difficult to resolve the great and complex task of disbanding the State Security Ministry.

This time too there have been digs at us. Western mass media claim that, while he was in Moscow, M. Wolf handed over to the KGB all the State Security Ministry's agents abroad. They also ascribe this to Hans Modrow, former chairman of the GDR Council of Ministers, who supposedly raised this question in conversation with N.I. Ryzhkov.

"Such claims are designed for very naive people," M. Wolf said. "Considering that the intelligence apparatus is at the stage of disintegration and counterintelligence is not working, and it must also be thought that the West German secret services are being very active on GDR territory, such an 'acquisition' would be an extreme case of thoughtlessness on the KGB's part." [passage omitted]

Romania's Iliescu Thanks Gorbachev for Greetings

PM3006191190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
30 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 5

[Message from Romanian President Ion Iliescu: "To USSR President M.S. Gorbachev"]

[Text] I sincerely thank you for the congratulations and good wishes sent on the occasion of my election as Romanian president.

I am convinced that all the prerequisites exist for the further development of relations of friendship and cooperation between Romania and the Soviet Union on a healthy, mutually advantageous basis in the interests of our countries and peoples and of peace and security in Europe.

I send you best wishes for success in your activity for the benefit of the Soviet Union's peoples.

[Signed] Ion Iliescu, Romanian president

Ryzhkov Congratulates Romania's Prime Minister

LD3006210690 Moscow TASS in English 1239 GMT
30 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 30 TASS—Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov warmly congratulated Romanian Prime Minister Petre Roman on his nomination.

Ryzhkov wrote in his message that he hopes the two countries will continue to expand cooperation in all spheres in the spirit of friendship and good-neighbourliness for the benefit of the Soviet and Romanian people, for peace in Europe and the world.

Sitaryan, Yugoslavia's Markovic Discuss Trade

LD3006140990 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 0506 GMT 30 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Anatoliy Bocharov]

[Text] Belgrade, 30 June (TASS)—Soviet-Yugoslav relations are developing successfully. However, the sides must through joint efforts find a solution to the problem of balancing trade exchanges between the two countries, which have become a kind of brake on further development of trade and economic cooperation. This was stressed at a meeting here on Friday between Ante Markovic, chairman of the Federal Executive Council (the government), and Stepan Sitaryan, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR State Foreign Economic Commission, who is visiting Yugoslavia. During their conversation it was noted that the problem may be solved by proceeding along a path of expanding joint investments and transferring to freely convertible currency in the settlement of accounts.

The attention of those involved in the meeting was focused on matters connected with the profound transformations and reforms being implemented in the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia.

Latin America & Caribbean

Relations With Cuba May Jeopardize U.S. Aid

PY3006001790 Moscow in Spanish to Cuba
0030 GMT 26 Jun 90

[From the "Glances" feature]

[Text] [Announcer] Let me now introduce to you Radio Moscow reporter (Viktor Antilov).

[(Antilov)] Dear friends. Tonight, as part of the "Glances" feature, I am going to talk with my Cuban colleague, Carlos Rafael Jimenez of Cuba's Radio Rebelde, in this very interesting program. How are you, Carlos, here in the Soviet Union?

[Jimenez] I am fine. I was hoping to find a real summer here, but what I have found is a summer that looks more like fall.

[(Antilov)] I also have here with me (William de Armas), who runs a newscast for CMKS radio station of Santiago de Cuba. How are you?

[(De Armas)] Very well, thank you. I am happy to be here to share this program with you.

[(Antilov)] As a starting point, I would like to talk about a very serious issue. We have just received information that U.S. President Bush said U.S. aid to the Soviet Union is still tied to Soviet aid to Cuba. In other words, George Bush is against Soviet aid to Cuba, therefore he questions U.S. economic and technological aid to the Soviet Union. Let me say that following the last summit, Mikhail Gorbachev submitted a report to the deputies of the Supreme Soviet. He said that the winds of the cold war still prevail in the U.S. position on relations with Cuba. Despite this explanation and other comments by Mikhail Gorbachev, who said that the Soviet Union supports fraternal relations of cooperation with Cuba, I believe that people are still alarmed and wonder about the real situation. How do you evaluate the state of Soviet-Cuban relations in the last few months, in the last few days? Is it weakening, or is it growing? What are people saying in Havana, and in Santiago de Cuba?

[Jimenez] For us Cubans, for the people of Havana, of Santiago de Cuba, there are no indications that our relations with the Soviet Union have changed in the last 30 years. For us, relations with the Soviet Union are the same relations of brotherhood and gratitude that we have learned over 30 years. We Cubans of various generations were educated thinking of love for the Soviet Union, love for the Soviet people, and this is a very important part of our social conduct and our way of looking at life. Although we now listen to many words which tend to confound, words which do not always tell the truth, the Cuban people feel [words indistinct] relations with the Soviet people have been, and we think it will be very important for our lives and our feelings. We interpret those relations in terms of solidarity and brotherhood.

[(Antilov)] [words indistinct] I recall that when the Soviet-Cuban summit was held, many U.S. reporters said that [words indistinct] the Soviet Union should demand payment of the Cuban debt. I believe this demand was not made by chance because [words indistinct] there was an objective in mind as you said. As a Soviet citizen I am also concerned that the comments [words indistinct] of some economists are heard questioning Soviet-Cuban cooperation. There are also reports from other economists [words indistinct] which show that our cooperation with Cuba is mutually beneficial. I would like to mention the fact that every third spoonful of sugar we use comes from Cuba. [words indistinct] I am concerned about information disseminated here and in Cuba. I would like to know what people think, for example, in Santiago de Cuba, in the port of Santiago de Cuba where there are many Soviet ships.

[(De Armas)] Well, I can tell you that in Santiago de Cuba, as in the rest of the country, fraternal feelings toward the Soviet Union remain unchanged. I would even go so far as to say that these fraternal feelings are growing. There is a deep-rooted love, a feeling of brotherhood. I can also tell you that even though at a given time, supplies may have been reduced because of temporary situations, the flow of supplies continues.

I would also like to tell you, although Carlos may have mentioned it in passing, that Cuba was very happy at the decisions of the Soviet committee regarding the drawing up of the cooperation agreement for the next five years which we hope to be able to sign in 1991, in early 1991. This agreement epitomizes the will of the two governments to maintain and even to expand both economic and [word indistinct] relations.

[(Antilov)] Speaking frankly, in Cuba, the freedom island as we call it, joint Soviet-Cuban projects of great significance for the Cuban economy such as the Cienfuegos petroleum refinery, the Matanzas-Cienfuegos oil pipeline and the nuclear plant, are moving forward.

[Jimenez] There is the Moa nickel plant [words indistinct] unchanged.

[(Antilov)] We could go on with this list of projects, but....

[Jimenez, interrupting] An endless list....

[(Antilov, continuing)] ...I would also like to say that I have seen lately that Cuba is trying to find new fields for cooperation. I would like to mention medicine as one of these fields. The Cubans have offered to conduct research projects with family doctors in Kaluga Province, in the Soviet Union. This is very important for us.

The Cuban comrades, the Cuban people have offered to help treat the children hurt by the Chernobyl tragedy at the best Cuban sea resorts. I am interested in the peoples' attitude toward such projects, because I am aware that in Cuba people do not have it all that easy after all. However, the government—as Commander in Chief

Fidel Castro has said—is prepared to offer the best that Cuba has to these children from the Soviet Union. I would like to know, what do the people on the street say about all this, because after all, it is one thing to [word indistinct] and quite another to see that the best is being given to these children when their own also deserve it.

[Jimenez] Fifteen days before coming to the Soviet Union we visited the Jose Marti Pioneers City in (Talara). We visited it because of the decision of Cuban pioneers to offer their city as a healing center, a sea resort, to treat Soviet children hurt by the Chernobyl accident, the Chernobyl disaster.

The Jose Marti Pioneers' City has 500 houses, an amphitheater, several movie theaters, amusement parks, etc. Thus, the Cuban pioneers have unanimously offered this city for 16,000 children to the Soviet children. The people of the capital, the workers of the minibrigades worked hard, everyone worked hard for 30 days to refurbish the city and make it beautiful for the children of Chernobyl and now it is ready.

The Cuban pioneers have given away their best facilities, the largest and most beautiful city on the sea east of Havana, to host the Soviet children. Thus, if we Cubans have been unable to do more to repay the help the Soviets have given us these 30 years, it is only because we are a small developing country and because we have had many problems due to the blockade and siege by the United States, the imperialist United States.

However, now that we have been able to do something about our development, thanks largely to Soviet cooperation, now that we are able to produce vaccines, medicines, and medical instruments, we have stated our willingness to turn over to the Soviet Union a portion of these medicines, these vaccines, and these medical instruments, to help pay our debt. There are some people who say: Cubans pay your debt to the Soviet Union. How much does this debt amount to? Is it 5 billion pesos or 15 billion pesos? The people who say this are short-sighted, because our debt to the Soviet people is everlasting. It cannot be paid back because it is much more than 5 billion rubles or 15 billion rubles. It is a permanent debt of gratitude and fraternal feelings that cannot be quantified, that cannot be measured in terms of billions of rubles. Thus, these people would do better to stop looking for new signs in Cuban-Soviet relations which, as far as the Cuban people are concerned, remain as firm as they have been since early 1960 when the two countries reestablished relations.

[(Antilov)] Dear listeners, I would like to remind you that you are listening to a roundtable which is part of the Radio Moscow program "Glances." We are talking with Radio Rebelde journalist Carlos Rafael Jimenez and journalist (William de Armas) of CNKS in Santiago de Cuba.

You probably know this comrades, because everyone knows this, and Radio Moscow does not hide it: Our people, the Soviet people, are living through difficult

times. I do not mean only the conflicts among the various nationalities that we have here. I am talking specifically about economic difficulties.

I imagine that these economic difficulties that we are having will have a negative impact on our ability to cooperate with other countries. Thus, Cuban friends, I repeat, our Cuban friends, we are interested in seeing Cuba diversify its cooperation with other countries. I mean, we want to see Cuba cooperating not only with the Soviet Union but with other countries as well. We want to see Cuba diversifying and expanding its relations. I do not know if I am making myself clear. If I am I would like to hear your opinion, your opinion as journalists, about Cuban relations with the rest of the world.

[(De Armas)] Of course. It is only natural that a large percentage of Cuba's foreign trade was directed at East European countries in general, and the Soviet Union in particular. The latter is being maintained but the former has declined somewhat, however. Cuba's economic strategy calls for the broadening of trade ties with all countries willing and able to do so.

[Words indistinct] the U.S. Government has been pressuring many countries, especially Latin American countries, to cease trading with Cuba, this has been an obstacle throughout these 30 years of U.S. blockade. However, our current policy calls for diversification and it is being implemented.

It so happens that [words indistinct] these commitments and now we are trying to broaden and strengthen them. Above and beyond everything else we are highly interested in and are working for Latin American economic integration because we believe that Latin America must join forces to be able to face up to the imperialists, to the capitalists.

[(Antilov)] What is the status of plans for encouraging tourism in Cuba because Cuba is a true paradise for tourists?

[Jimenez] Our main resorts are in Varadero, and some places along the northeastern coast, we also have some resorts in Pinar del Rio. We have a very daring, very large project that has begun to yield some results. One example of these results is the (Palmeras del Sol) hotel that was dedicated recently. This is a joint project with Spain. We plan to build almost 100 such hotels in the area of Varadero which, as you well know, is an area of outstanding natural beauty and exceptional sights, appropriate for developing tourist facilities. We also plan to make large investments in tourist projects along the western coast of Pinar del Rio. Thus, we plan to turn our island, our "green cayman" as the *companeros* call it, into a prominent tourist area which will gradually become an important source of funds for the country, as is the case in other countries that have beautiful natural sites like we do.

[(Antilov)] Very well, thank you *companeros* for this interesting conversation on the program *Glances*. As a

person, not a Soviet journalist, I would like to conclude this conversation by wishing the best for Cuban plans for social and economic development so that Cuba may continue to set an example for the other Latin American countries, a clean and honorable example, as it has always done throughout these 30 years of Cuban revolution. Once again, thank you very much *companeros*.

Rear Admiral Gorbunov Leads Naval Visit to Cuba

LD2906093590 Moscow TASS in English 0918 GMT
29 Jun 90

[Text] Havana June 29 TASS—Raul Castro, first deputy chairman of the Cuban State Council, first deputy prime minister and minister of the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Cuba, received the commander of a unit of Soviet naval ships, Rear Admiral Aleksandr Gorbunov. They had a lengthy conversation. Soviet charge d'affaires in Cuba Vladimir Kiselev and chief of the General Staff of the Revolutionary Armed Forces Ulises del Toro, were also present.

The Soviet naval ships visiting here include the large anti-submarine ship Azov, destroyer Gremyashchiy and tanker Genrikh Gasanov.

Warships End Visit

LD0207052690 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 0200 GMT 2 Jul 90

[By TASS correspondent Sergey Staroselskiy]

[Text] Havana, 2 Jul (TASS)—A detachment of Soviet warships composed of the large antisubmarine warfare ship Azov, the Guards destroyer Gremyashchiy, and the tanker Genrikh Gasanov, which was in the country at the invitation of the government of Cuba, left the port of Havana on Sunday.

During the course of the visit, the Soviet sailors were acquainted with the sights and historical monuments of Cuba and had meetings with their Cuban colleagues.

Rear Admiral Aleksandr Gorbunov, commander of the detachment, was received by Raul Castro, first vice president of the Council of State of the Republic, first vice president of the Council of Ministers and minister of the Revolutionary Armed Forces. They had a long conversation at which Vladimir Kiselev, temporary charge d'affaires of the USSR to the Republic of Cuba, (Ulises del Toro), chief of the general staff of the Revolutionary Armed Forces of the country, and other officials were present.

Cuba's Castro Offers Aid to Chernobyl Victims

*LD0207112490 Moscow TASS in English 1112 GMT
2 Jul 90*

[By TASS correspondent Sergey Staroselskiy]

[Text] Havana July 2 TASS—Cuban leader Fidel Castro on Sunday invited 30,000 Soviet children a year for recreation and medical treatment in Cuba.

He was addressing a meeting devoted to the end of preparatory work at the Jose Marti pioneer camp, which is to receive victims of the Chernobyl disaster. The first group of Soviet children is expected to arrive in Havana on Monday.

Castro said after the Cuban initiative was voiced, some Western countries, including the United States, declared they were also ready to receive 1,000 Soviet children for recreation.

The Cuban leader said Cuba could receive 50,000 Chernobyl victims if they arrived only for recreation. He said Soviet children will be treated by qualified physicians using the most up-to-date medicines.

Soviet Charge d'Affaires ad Interim in Cuba Vladimir Kiselev thanked the Cuban people for their solidarity and friendly assistance.

Political & Social

Gorbachev's First 100 Days as President Viewed

PM0307090590 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA
PRAVDA in Russian 24 Jun 90 p 2

[Interview with political scientist Igor Klyamkin by KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA correspondent Andrey Kabannikov: "The President's First 100 Days"]

[Text] [Kabannikov] Igor Moiseyevich, since the newly elected president delivered his first speech 100 days have elapsed. In this speech he had declared that the country was faced with two key problems: radicalization of the economic reform and renewal of the federation. The president seemed in a decisive mood. Has any progress been achieved in the past 100 days? The program for transition to the market, put forward by the government, has convinced neither society nor the Supreme Soviet.

[Klyamkin] I see more progress in the fact that this program has been blocked than if it had been adopted. In my opinion, the government program is not a program for transition to the market, but rather an attempt to combine the necessity for such a transition with the interests of the central bureaucracy. It is an attempt to help the bureaucracy cope with its difficulties under the guise of a transition to the market, that is to say it is an attempt to eliminate the budget deficit by means of raising prices. Not even the president in his first 100 days has dared to go against the bureaucracy and move in the direction of a genuine market, because opposing the bureaucracy is possible only if you can rely on society's backing. And it is not easy to gain this kind of backing for the implementation of unpopular measures which are inevitable during the transition to the market. This is why all the efforts as regards the market have again petered out.

[Kabannikov] Does this mean that we are doomed to wasting time, to constantly avoiding the solution of the most pressing problems which should have been resolved long ago?

[Klyamkin] I believe that our failures contain a very important lesson, namely that we have been looking for the key to our problems in the wrong place. It has become increasingly obvious of late that a radical economic reform cannot be implemented from the center. At least not democratically.

[Kabannikov] You mean it has become obvious to you, or are you talking about the president?

[Klyamkin] The president among others. In any case, a new note has appeared in his utterances toward the end of the first 100 days. It can be assumed that Gorbachev has come to the conclusion that without the devolution of all responsibility for the implementation of the economic reform to republics this reform is impracticable since the republics and their parliaments will not agree to unpopular measures dictated by the center. And that

means that reform is not possible without a new Union treaty. This is probably why Gorbachev has decided to step up work on this treaty through the Council of the Federation.

[Kabannikov] What, in your opinion, are the reasons for this turn of events?

[Klyamkin] The main reason is life itself, the events which are taking place. I can see at least four events in the past 100 days which may have prompted this new viewpoint.

You will recall that the problem of Lithuania arose at the dawn of Gorbachev's presidency. I believe that the whole significance of this problem was not understood to begin with. The act of the restoration of Lithuania's independence was perceived in Moscow merely as a provocative and unlawful gesture leading to the country's disintegration. But it was Lithuania which by its defiant decision was the first to declare clearly and unequivocally: Without the political independence of republics reforms are unthinkable. To begin with Moscow tried to turn a blind eye to the problem exposed by Vilnius. As you know, Moscow's response to the "nocturnal coup" was economic sanctions.

[Kabannikov] But after all, Lithuania had not acted "in accordance with the rules."

[Klyamkin] It had acted against the rules because it no longer believed that it could achieve anything by following the rules. Someone had to risk it and, by cutting through the knot of imperial ties and traditions, be the first to show the others that the impossible was possible. Riga and Tallinn followed suit. Lithuania's blockade did not intimidate or stop them. And, finally, Russia proclaimed its sovereignty, this time without violating the rules. This is the second event which, I believe, may have seriously influenced the president's political stance.

[Kabannikov] Do you not rate this as the most significant event of the past 100 days?

[Klyamkin] This event must be seen in the light of the past four centuries rather than the last 100 days. Russia has always been the center with which other peoples allied themselves as a result of their own or someone else's will. A Russia which cuts itself off from the center is a Russia which cuts itself off from itself. This is absurd from the viewpoint of the logic of a military empire, whose various parts stick together thanks to their constant perception of an external threat. A military empire demands supercentralization based on a bureaucratic command system. A market economy, on the other hand, demands decentralization and division into separate independent territories. In a multinational country, these territories will inevitably be based on national units.

[Kabannikov] During the past 100 days the president, as is known, had problems in connection with Yeltsin's election.

[Klyamkin] Yes, clearly the latter gave rise to fears as a result of his unpredictability, "uncontrollability," and independence from the apparatus, compounded by his tremendous popularity among the people. But with Yeltsin it is possible to advance, to proceed toward the market and democracy, whereas with the right wing it is possible at best to mark time. Furthermore, Yeltsin's popularity guarantees, at least for a time, stability in the country's main region and staves off the threat of an explosion, and specifically the explosion of strikes.

[Kabannikov] In general, it seems that the relations which have developed between the president and the opposition are fairly complex. Let's just recall the May Day demonstration in Red Square which has caused such a stir. A great deal has been said and written about the "extremists" who spoiled the event. It seems to me that it is not so much a question of "extremists" as of the fact that the emergence of an opposition as such has put paid to the old ritual of reviewing the "parade" of loyal sentiments from the roof of the Mausoleum. As for the opposition from the left and its pressure on Gorbachev, it is well known and it is visible. We were less well informed about opposition from the right. I must say that I was surprised by Gorbachev's remarks during his meeting with U.S. Congressmen: "I take a step, and they say it is a blow to socialism. I take another step, and they say I have broken up the party. I take another...and I have destroyed the Soviet Union...."

[Klyamkin] Most probably there has been pressure on Gorbachev from the right, it simply could not be otherwise. But Yeltsin's election has strengthened the left wing and this has affected the president's position, above all as regards the key question of republics' independence.

[Kabannikov] You mentioned four factors which have prompted him to move in this direction, but you have specified only two.

[Klyamkin] The third was the blocking by certain republican parliaments of the government program of transition toward the market. This probably served to reinforce the conviction that nothing can be achieved proceeding from the center. And the fourth factor was the visit to Canada and the United States which you have mentioned, Western public opinion, and the linkage between the signing of the Soviet-American agreements and the settlement of the Lithuanian crisis. In his BBC interview which was published 10 June, the president declared for the first time that he favors a Union in which the rights of the center are delegated by the republics. His speech at the USSR Supreme Soviet expressing readiness to drop the former demand that Lithuania must renounce its declaration of independence, and open negotiations provided the declaration is suspended, falls into the same category. And finally, there is the attempt to accelerate the drafting of the Union treaty.

[Kabannikov] However immediately afterward Ligachev, addressing the peasant congress, declared publicly—and also for the first time—his disagreement with the course of the leadership whose policy leads to a division of the USSR, claiming that if compromises continue to be made it is possible to lose everything.

[Klyamkin] Take a look at what is happening at the Constituent Congress of the Russian Communist Party. If in the past Gorbachev was openly criticized from the left, the heavy blows are now coming from the other side. The apparatus has grasped that it is beginning to lose power in practice rather than just in words. Furthermore there is Gorbachev's and Yeltsin's intention to cooperate constructively. And so it cannot be ruled out that the second 100 days will be devoted to clarifying relations with the conservatives rather than the radicals.

[Kabannikov] Nonetheless, there are a number of points I would like to make. The post of president was established primarily with a view to strengthening central power. Now it appears that he is, on the contrary, weakening this power by delegating it to the republics.

[Klyamkin] This is not a weakening of the center, it is the beginning of a fundamental transformation of its role and functions. The first 100 days have shown that the old center which dictated its will to the republics cannot be strengthened by means of establishing new posts. What is good for a military empire cannot be adapted to suit a democracy. The center can only be strengthened if it receives its power from the republics themselves.

[Kabannikov] But will they be willing to invest it with any powers?

[Klyamkin] I believe that this is a possibility. There are matters which it is advantageous to entrust to the center—defense and diplomacy, for instance. In addition, during the transition to the market new functions of the center in the economy will probably come to light. It cannot be ignored, after all, that none of the republics are ready for competing on the world market and that economically they are dependant on each other. And that includes Lithuania. It is another matter however, that the conflict with Lithuania has gone too far and that it is quite possible that it will refuse now to enter even a confederation.

[Kabannikov] However, this protracted quest by the center for its new functions makes many people feel that everything is going toward doom and destruction fraught with the gravest of consequences. Incidentally, it is no accident that appeals can again be heard for establishing a committee of national salvation under the president.

[Klyamkin] This is all very interesting, but what nationality will it salvage? No, this is a weak idea. It is not possible to breathe new life into the old center.

[Kabannikov] So on whom can the president rely in steering the new course? On what economic and political forces can he lean? There is talk for instance about the

social base of the economic reform—peasant farmers, highly skilled, highly paid workers, entrepreneurs....

[Klyamkin] which, you are trying to say, essentially do not exist yet nor can they exist while there is no market?

[Kabannikov] Precisely. But the situation is unclear even as regards political forces. The president has said more than once that he intends to rely on the renewed soviets. But they have not become an important force. Or rather, as in the case of Moscow or Leningrad, they have become a new source of conflict with the center instead of a support. The upshot is that even 100 days on the president is forced to rely on the old structures of power. How can he implement reforms with their assistance? And is it possible in *general* in these conditions to manage the country democratically?

[Klyamkin] In order to rule democratically, it is necessary to take democracy to its rightful conclusion. And above all to conclude a new Union treaty. After what has happened at the first Congress of the People's Deputies of Russia, it is clear that political conditions to overcome the resistance of the apparatus are taking shape. I believe that the president's main support, if he wants to take the road of reforms, could be above all the civilized forces of national rebirth in the republics and the renewed soviets formed by these forces. It is true that this will inevitably evoke the dissatisfaction and concern of national minorities in republics, including the Russian-speaking population. However, given Russia's sovereignty this should not turn into a problem for the new center affecting the Russian people as a whole. The nationalities question is today the main source of conflicts and the main reason for the waning authority of the center. It is necessary to try and turn it into the source of consolidation and increased confidence in the center. There is no other way.

[Kabannikov] You are saying that we should proceed toward the market via the solution of the nationality question and via the Union treaty. But there is the example of Yugoslavia which took this road at the time, granting independence to its republics. But we know that this has led to their self-isolation rather than to the creation of a developed all-Yugoslav market. Meanwhile the nationalities question has not only not been resolved but has grown even more acute.

[Klyamkin] You are quiet right. But Yugoslavia's experience only serves as a warning that economic independence without political independence leads to isolation. The creation of a Union-wide market is advantageous for everyone in our country. However in order to grasp this advantage, republics must feel free. If this is not the case, they will inevitably try to make up for the humiliation caused by lack of freedom by asserting their pride which will lead to self-isolation. I am not trying to say in the least, of course, that by proceeding toward the market via the political sovereignty of the republics all problems will be resolved overnight and with ease. No, there will be problems, and very complex problems at that. They

will arise both inside the republics (states), and in their relations with each other and with the center. However overcoming even the most difficult problems will be easier than finding a way out of the impasse created by conducting reforms from the center.

[Kabannikov] Allow me to recapitulate. Igor Moiseyevich. During the first 100 days events have taken place which have indicated profound changes in the federation and forced Gorbachev to introduce corrections in his political course. Does this spell victory or defeat for the president?

[Klyamkin] It spells a crushing defeat for great-power policy. But if the president really intends to consign this policy to the past for good, then it spells a major victory for him.

'Thwarted Ambition' Drove KGB Whistle-Blower

PM0207123790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
28 Jun 90 Second Edition p 6

[Report by V. Ivanov; first paragraph is PRAVDA introduction; under the rubric "From Competent Sources": "Everyone Chooses His Own Destiny"]

[Text] In connection with the KGB's statement—see PRAVDA 23 June this year—with regard to utterances and interviews by former KGB staffer O.D. Kalugin, PRAVDA's correspondent asked the USSR KGB Public Relations Center to comment on this situation in somewhat greater detail, taking into account the newspaper readers' numerous wishes, particularly as the KGB had promised to make an all-around assessment of his utterances. Here is what our correspondent was told there.

O. Kalugin is now putting in appearances in much mass media, not only Soviet but foreign. His interviews have been broadcast by Radio Liberty and the BBC and gone out over other "voices." Numerous responses, assessments, and commentaries have appeared. Taking their cue from Kalugin, they contain a lot that is false and unscrupulous, and create a distorted picture of perestroika in the KGB and of the staffers' moral and professional qualities. This is what we would like to say first of all.

These utterances are made sensational by the fact that O. Kalugin previously held leading posts in the KGB. But a general's rank and length of service, as Kalugin himself demonstrates, certainly do not mean that a person is telling the truth. We believe that O. Kalugin's claims and actions, which he conceals behind political motives, are chiefly accounted for by thwarted ambition. But this is a purely psychological aspect and certainly not the final conclusion.

In March this year he was ordered to be transferred to the reserve—which does not often happen to 55-year-old generals. He now declares that he quit the KGB of his own accord. But that is untrue. On being dismissed he told his leadership: "You will regret this!" And he

essentially repeated the same thing in a WASHINGTON POST interview: "The chief made a mistake by dismissing me at such an age. If I had been 65 or 70, I might have kept quiet."

We have now seen for ourselves that Kalugin kept his "parting word." It gives us no pleasure to reply to his fabrications, but we are forced to do so because the honor and dignity of our personnel—whom he calls in his utterances "swindlers and extortioners, murderers and smugglers, criminals of every type, and racketeers of a modern kind"—have been wounded.

Of course there are shortcomings in the KGB's work and we do not hide them. We strive to work together with the public, and we are becoming more open within the limits of what a special service can reveal. We favor criticism from any quarter, but principled and constructive criticism. This is very important today when profound changes are taking place in the committee within the framework of the processes of perestroika.

The KGB is being sent masses of telegrams. People are indignant at Kalugin's conduct and ask to be told what sort of person he is.

O. Kalugin began his service in the state security organs in 1952. At the end of the fifties he spent a year studying at Columbia University in the United States with a small group of Soviet trainees. Then he worked in the United States in the sixties. His knowledge of foreign languages and his ability to get on with people helped him in his profession as an intelligence officer. During that period he climbed the official ladder quite rapidly. The peculiarities of his character, as became clear subsequently, prevented Kalugin from standing the test of responsibility. His weaknesses on a professional and a purely human level became particularly noticeable after his appointment as leader of the External Counterintelligence Administration. It was at that time that—in addition to his characteristic pushiness, which even won people over—his ambition, disregard of others' opinions, rancor, and tendency to flaunt his connections began to be increasingly clearly manifested.

You might ask: If the KGB saw all this, why did it keep him on? It is not so easy to answer this question. The mistakes are obvious now. Our work is extremely complex and no one, generally speaking, is insured against errors. All the same you want to have faith in a person, and there are situations where only time puts everything in its proper place. We hoped that Kalugin would himself understand and be able to take a more critical look at himself and to cope with his shortcomings. We repeatedly gave him advice and made comments. But unfortunately, he did not draw the proper conclusions. On the contrary, instances of Kalugin's incorrect behavior became increasingly alarming and the success rate in the work of the subdepartment for suppressing the actions of foreign states' special services, which he headed, was low. In addition, the far from harmless leaking of information was worrying.

The conclusion that he needed to be replaced in the post of leader of external counterintelligence finally resulted from the fact that a very valuable source, who worked in the CIA, was lost as a result of his incompetent, arrogant actions. We cannot name that person at present. The circumstances of that affair were the subject of a serious investigation in the KGB.

Incidentally, it is not hard to appreciate that the mass media, despite all our respect for them, are not the forum where it is appropriate to discuss in detail specific questions of the special services' work and affairs. For there are categories such as secrecy and security which no one is permitted to disregard. Otherwise people will suffer. We do not think that this requires special explanation.

In 1979 Kalugin was transferred to work in the USSR KGB Administration for Leningrad Oblast. He now endeavors to portray the matter as though his transfer was occasioned by his intercession for a scientist, initial K., who had "suffered innocently" at the hands of state security organs. This again is untrue. There is a document in which Kalugin confirms in his own hand the legality of the "scientist's" conviction for speculation in currency and antiques.

It is an important point that after Kalugin's removal the External Counterintelligence Administration began working as it should. Changes were not long in coming and they were simply astounding. In a short space of time dozens of agents of foreign states' intelligence services—Soviet citizens—were exposed and put on trial. Some of them have already been reported on, while the story of others is still to be told. The Western special services at once felt these blows from Soviet counterintelligence. We do not wish to say that Kalugin had a direct bearing on cases of treachery, but it is a fact that he had no bearing on their exposure.

In Leningrad Kalugin was given an opportunity to show his worth in a new work sector. However, this did not happen. Here too he was not particularly noted for his results in the official field. On the other hand, he excelled in a different field: in writing "unmasking" statements, including complaints against KGB staffers. In fact, he is continuing this line now. Kalugin ascribed to them misdemeanors which they had not committed, but it was necessary to set up commissions, conduct checks lasting many months, and expend masses of effort and time.

In his utterances today Kalugin constantly refers to the fact that he repeatedly complained to the CPSU Central Committee about the state security organs and accused them of failing to fulfill tasks and violating socialist legality and the norms of official ethics and morality. Yes, he did. But what came to light during the work of the competent commissions to check his statements was quite the opposite.

Thus, for example, with his direct involvement the KGB's Gatchina City Department committed illegal actions with regard to persons under investigation by the

city prosecutor's office in cases of embezzlement and bribetaking. In violation of criminal procedural legislation persons under investigation were brought to the KGB city department where they were interviewed, without the investigator being present, for the purpose of persuading them to testify against themselves and other citizens. Such "interviews" frequently lasted many hours, sometimes at night, without any procedural legalization. After this was exposed, the USSR KGB severely punished the guilty persons. A corresponding assessment was also made of Kalugin's actions—about which all KGB organs were informed even then in 1987.

Kalugin was always distinguished by a desire to acquire influential connections. Those who knew him more closely could not fail to notice his taste for the bohemian life style and his habit of throwing parties, using his official position.

In order to defuse the unhealthy atmosphere which had begun to form in the collective of the KGB Administration for Leningrad Oblast in connection with Kalugin's conduct, he was transferred to Moscow where he no longer had a direct bearing on the work of operational subdepartments.

All these circumstances and Kalugin's emphatically negligent attitude to work made it impossible for him to remain in the chekists' ranks. Although he made an overt attempt to resort to blackmail, threatening new "exposures" if dismissed, the KGB did no deal with its conscience. The general was transferred to the reserve, and it was then that he declared: "You will regret this!"

We certainly do not regret ridding ourselves of Kalugin, it was emphasized at the end of the conversation. Honest people who are devoted to their cause work in the KGB today. They strictly fulfill the Soviet laws and wage a far from easy struggle in the interests of the country's security. You could not call theirs a quiet life. It demands a constant exertion of intellectual, moral, and physical effort and very great civic responsibility to the present and the future. And it leaves a very bitter taste when some staffer embarks on a path of illegal actions, behaves unworthily on a moral plane, and what is more resorts to treachery.

The "revelations" of the general who found himself without a job were naturally welcomed in certain circles. "Kalugin's utterances against his department," CIA official spokesman M. Mansfield declared, "have been assessed positively in the CIA." The Venezuelan newspaper EL UNIVERSAL, which you cannot suspect of liking the KGB, in turn remarked that "Kalugin's utterances resemble, rather, the confessions of a traitor."

Well, everyone is free to choose his own destiny. Anyone has the right to express his own opinion. This, incidentally, is an achievement of perestroika. The law's requirement is the sole limitation. For special services personnel, official secrets and professional ethics are added to this. Not just in our country. Throughout the world.

KGB Criticizes Excesses on Border Troops Day

LD0207133990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1100 GMT 2 Jul 90

[Text] The USSR KGB public relations center reports that the USSR KGB has held a meeting that gave a principled political evaluation of the case of breaches of public order by several reserve soldiers during the celebrations of Border Troop Day on 28 May. These breaches were severely criticized. It was noted that work with former border troops is not carried out everywhere actively and purposefully. The link with society on these questions is insufficiently effective. The USSR KGB Border Troops Command has been instructed to take effective measures to further strengthen the moral education of border troops—first and foremost while they are serving in close cooperation with soviet, party, and Komsomol organizations—and to maintain constant contact with soldiers of the reserve in the provinces. Military registration and enlistment offices, labor collectives, and reserve soldiers' clubs are to be used more in achieving these aims. Specific measures also are planned to essentially improve the preparation for and holding of celebratory events.

'Whole Truth' on Semipalatinsk Site Urged

PM0307085790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
1 Jul 90 Morning Edition p1

[Report by A. Stepovoy under the rubric "On Topical Subjects": "No One Wanted To Understand; Notes From a Press Conference Which Was More Like a Rally"]

[Text] This press conference, held in the press center of the USSR Supreme Soviet on 29 June, was rather scathingly named "The Semipalatinsk Test Site: Truth and Fiction." Soviet and foreign journalists had been invited to a meeting with people's deputies of the USSR and Kazakhstan; representatives of the USSR Defense Ministry, the USSR Ministry of Nuclear Power Generation and the Nuclear Industry, the USSR Health Ministry, and the "Nevada-Semipalatinsk" social movement; and inhabitants of cities and villages situated in the nuclear test site area. The press conference had been initiated by a group of USSR people's deputies headed by N. Petrushenko.

The body of press conference participants said that at least two points of view on the problem would be voiced at the meeting: The view of those with an interest in preserving the test site, on the one hand, and the view of those anxious to protect the interests of people living in this region, on the other. But these points of view are already fairly well known as they have been given broad coverage in the mass media. Consequently, all the journalists attending the press conference naturally expected to hear something new, hitherto unknown, and necessary and useful to the broad public. Unfortunately these expectations were not lived up to. What is more, there was no actual press conference as such. Journalists did

not even get clear, unambiguous answers to the many specific questions they raised. They did not even manage to obtain reliable information that would either confirm or refute the conjectures—of which a fair number have accumulated, of course, in the 40-year vacuum of top secrecy—which, according to those in favor of retaining the Semipalatinsk test site, are inciting local inhabitants to ill-considered and dangerous behavior and action. Those opposed to nuclear tests on Kazakh soil—or to be more precise, in the bowels of the earth—had not done the best job of preparing their defense either. They used arguments which, with all due respect for their views, could hardly be called serious. That of course is not so much their fault as their misfortune. But the pressure they brought to bear and their reluctance to even hear out the arguments of their opponents created the atmosphere of a rally and open confrontation in the hall.

Well, and what did those with a monopoly on all available information about the test site—namely the representatives of the Defense Ministry, the Ministry of Nuclear Power Generation and the Nuclear Industry, and the Health Ministry—have to offer instead of turbulent emotions? Virtually nothing. Everything they said amounted to assurances that the Semipalatinsk test site is now virtually the safest place in the country in environmental respects. Yes, they were forced to admit, 30 or 40 years ago it had all been quite different, but now.... And so on in the familiar spirit. They did not mention a single one of the problems which are doubtlessly being encountered by the people developing the latest types of nuclear weapons.

But we now know the cost of the triumphant reports and historic achievements with which we have been so lavishly regaled for decades by ministries and departments. The people have developed a strong immunity of distrust of everything that comes from the higher authorities. The same would be true even if they were now being given totally reliable information. He who has deceived once will never be believed, as the old saying goes. So can one really feel resentful against people from whom the **whole truth** about the Semipalatinsk test site has been concealed and is still being concealed?

The "defense" sees the other side as solely to blame for the situation that has developed around the test site, accusing the "attackers" of being unpatriotic, short-sighted, and even of engaging in blatant political intrigue. We will not completely deny that some forces are trying to exploit the "test site allergy" that has arisen among a considerable proportion of the local inhabitants in their own interests. But this is, after all, a consequence rather than a cause.

The cause really lies in the top secrecy. We are still hiding more from our own people than people in America know. So is it any wonder that people here are increasingly skeptical of Soviet specialists and demand the opinion of independent, international panels of experts?

The organizers of the press conference urged journalists to persuade people living in Kazakhstan that the test site is harmless, remove the tension and mistrust toward those carrying out the tests, and open their eyes to the state of affairs. It grieved us to hear this because laymen cannot and do not have the right to do what nuclear specialists cannot do—or do not really want to do? The task of journalists is to distribute reliable information. But reliable information is something that is still in extremely short supply.

But that is our point of view. Representatives of the military-industrial complex assured us at the press conference that they have in fact given away too much to the public. They expressed fears that their excessive candor could be detrimental to the Soviet Union's defense capability. Even if you agree with this highly debatable argument, what has information locked away in the Health Ministry's special safes, hidden from glasnost, got to do with "defense"? Eighty percent of all information on the effects of nuclear tests on people who either have lived or are living now in the Semipalatinsk test site region has been declassified, according to a spokesman for this department. One must assume that not the most inoffensive information comprises the remaining 20 percent that is still classified....

But in the meantime.... On the day the press conference "The Semipalatinsk Test Site: Truth and Fiction" was held, journalists were informed by Doctor of Medical Sciences Professor M. Zhangelova from Kazakhstan that a one-hour warning strike was held in Semipalatinsk and patients announced a three-day hunger strike. They want to know the whole truth about the test site. And no one can deny them that right.

TV Reportage on Conference

PM0307093590 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1700 GMT 29 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast; reportage by O. Bobin, V. Krasnoyarskiy, identified by caption]

[Text] [Announcer] The Chernobyl tragedy has forced us to view many things in a different light. The question of the nuclear test sites at Semipalatinsk and Novaya Zemlya has acquired particular urgency. People want to know what is happening there, they want to know about the impact of the tests on the ecological situation and people's health. The veil of secrecy which hung over nuclear tests for many years has induced people to seek the truth themselves. Following another test in February of last year, the first antinuclear movement in our country—the Nevada-Semipalatinsk Movement—was organized in Kazakhstan. From the outset it declared its intention to strive for nuclear-free zones not just in Kazakhstan and the USSR but throughout the world.

A press conference devoted to the Semipalatinsk test site was held at the USSR Supreme Soviet.

[Correspondent] "Semipalatinsk Test Site—Truth and Fabrications": this was the title of the press conference convened by USSR people's deputies and attended, in addition to Soviet and foreign correspondents, by Kazakh people's deputies, representatives of the Nevada-Semipalatinsk public movement, and military and scientific staff from the test site.

The fraught atmosphere in the hall, which was reminiscent of rallies at times, was affected by the echoes of explosions in Nevada earlier this month and a warning one-hour strike in Semipalatinsk today. [video shows delegates in hall, and a shot of a newspaper article on the Nevada explosions]

[M.B. Zhangelova, Doctor of Medical Sciences, identified by caption] We have held a public referendum among the inhabitants of the oblast; 97 percent of the people questioned gave their names and addresses in the questionnaires and expressed themselves unequivocally for the immediate closure of the nuclear test site.

[Correspondent] A group of USSR people's deputies who visited Semipalatinsk recently published the following data: The incidence of cancer per 100,000 inhabitants totals 350 in the United States, 250 in the USSR, 290 in Moscow, and in Semipalatinsk 208—which is below the average for the country as a whole. What is the reason for the heated arguments of those who actually live there? If it is a case of radiation phobia, people are not to be blamed for this. It has come to light that 456 explosions were carried out in Semipalatinsk. Nevada responded with 1,000. It appears that our approach to these tests is more sensible, but for many years this has been subject to such secrecy and surrounded by such legends and rumors that it is virtually impossible now to destroy the stereotypes which have taken shape.

The test site is currently being blamed for all the ecological sins in that region, even those which it is not responsible for, and this is further exacerbating the unhealthy atmosphere. Furthermore, the region's needs in the social sphere were ignored for many years. Many problems need to be resolved. The main point is that all the participants favor silencing the nuclear explosions. Their approaches differ, however.

Conference on Future of Nuclear Power Held

PM0307093790 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1700 GMT 29 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast; reportage by Aleksandr Fedorovich, identified by caption, on Obninsk "Nuclear Power in the USSR" conference, including brief interview with V.V. Orlov, president of USSR Nuclear Society]

[Text] [Announcer] An all-Union conference on "Nuclear Power in the USSR—Problems, Prospects, Ecology, Economy, and Law" has ended in Obninsk. It

was organized by the USSR Nuclear Society in cooperation with the IAEA [International Atomic Energy Agency].

[Correspondent] A four-day discussion has taken place here which has been rated as useful and necessary by experts. A wide range of questions from the current situation in the nuclear power industry to the view taken of this situation by the public has been discussed. Naturally, the discussion was devoted above all to the atom which brings light, heat, and other benefits to people. This means 35 years of the development of nuclear power engineering in the USSR; it means 15 operational AES's [nuclear electric power stations] which produce 12.7 percent of the electricity generated in the country; unfortunately, it also means the catastrophes in the southern Urals and Chernobyl, tragedies which people must learn to understand and draw lessons from no matter how bitter these lessons are.

AES's have become the target of public criticism. A devaluation of confidence in science has taken place. So what is to happen next? Alas, there is no real alternative to nuclear power engineering as yet. This means that what we need are a new generation of safe nuclear reactors and many other things, including also a law on nuclear power engineering in the USSR.

Scientists have proposed that the viewpoint of the country's nuclear community be defined and scientifically substantiated answers provided to key questions of the development of nuclear power engineering at present and in the future.

The nuclear forum went beyond a national framework. Leading scientists and experts from 15 countries of the world were present. The conference is planning to issue a final document—a white book on the nuclear power industry.

Here is a brief interview:

[V.V. Orlov, president of the USSR Nuclear Society and Lenin Prize winner, identified by caption] I consider that the dialogue with the public which has been under way in our country for several years now, having started in the wake of Chernobyl, is exceptionally important both for society itself and for nuclear power industry workers. It is our task to continue and maintain this dialogue and make it increasingly sophisticated and competent.

Commission on Soviet Germans Holds Session

PM0207130590 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 28 Jun 90 Second Edition p 2

[Report: "In the State Commission for Problems of Soviet Germans"]

[Text] A routine session of the state commission heard a report from M.P. Vyshinskiy, USSR deputy minister of justice, on the status of citizens of German nationality who were mobilized during the war to form workers columns or who worked in various branches of industry

for the needs of the country's defense. Soviet Germans in the workers columns worked conscientiously in tough camp conditions, by their labor bringing closer our country's victory over fascist Germany. A decision was adopted on rewarding these people and extending the appropriate benefits to them.

Information from the State Committee for Labor and Social Problems about additional work on the program to meet Soviet Germans' needs for educating and training cadres of German nationality was discussed. The clarified program was ratified by the state commission. Union and republic organs of state management have been instructed to reflect the appropriate measures from this program in draft state plans for economic and social development and in the state budgets for 1991.

A plan for the commission's work in the second half of 1990 was ratified.

Certain organizational questions regarding preparation for the Congress of Soviet Germans were examined.

Democratic Platform Holds All-Union Conference

90UN2175A Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 17 Jun 90 p 1

[Report by I. Sichka: "In the Issue"]

[Text] The Second All-Union Conference of the Democratic Platform opened yesterday. The tone of the conference was set in the speeches of Coordination Council members V. Lysenko, I. Chubays, and V. Shestakovskiy. There was one underlying idea: No radical reforms will take place in the CPSU. The party leadership rejects any dialog with the Democratic Platform whose representatives are kept completely aside from any preparation for the All-Russia party conference and for the 28th congress. What are the conclusions? I. Chubays insists that they should lose no time and start immediately discussing alternate party structures. However, V. Lysenko and some other delegates still think it necessary to address the congress with their ideas and to leave the party in an organized manner if they are defeated. Both yesterday and today the delegates were discussing the congress documents, the tactics and the strategy of their behavior, and the limits of possible compromises.

The conference did not go without a sensation. Former KGB Lieutenant General O. Kalugin literally raised the roof with his presentation. He spoke about the many facets of the current KGB activity and created a fury of indignation among the delegates with his speech. "...If we seriously want to succeed with perestroika, we cannot work hand in hand with the organization which has penetrated every pore of our social organism. With the knowledge and approval of the party it interferes in all affairs of the government and public life, our economy and culture, science and sports, and religion. There is not one sphere where the hand or the shadow of the KGB is not present...." It seems we will hear this name again in the nearest future.

Journal Editors View Trends in Print Media

90US1050A Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Jun 90
Second Edition p 2

["Abridged report" of discussion at USSR Exhibition of Achievements of the National Economy during PRAVDA festival with journal editors and writers, by N. Demidov; date not specified: "Journalism and the Future of the Country"]

[Text] A discussion was held at the USSR Exhibition of Achievements of the National Economy during a PRAVDA festival, the topic of which we made into the headline of this article. We are publishing some of the presentations in an abridged form. The following took part in the discussion: members of the editorial board of the journal KOMMUNIST Otto Latsis and Igor Dedkov; writer Albert Likhonov, chairman of the imeni V.I. Lenin Soviet Children's Fund; Feodosiy Vidrashku, first deputy editor of the journal NOVYY MIR; playwright Mikhail Shatrov; Grigoriy Baklanov, editor in chief of the journal ZNAMYA; Director of Pushkin House Nikolay Skatov; Yegor Yakovlev, editor in chief of the newspaper MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI; and Vladimir Krupin, editor in chief of the journal MOSKVA. The meeting was moderated by Viktor Kozhemyako, PRAVDA editor of the press and journalism department.

[Latsis] Representatives of, so to say, well-known factions in journalism which are opposed to each other are present here. Many arguments of both sides are already known. Still, I think that we communicate and meet to discuss seriously the issues of our journalism too seldom.

Our country is in an alarming condition. The entire world is looking at us not only with interest and hope but also with a dose of amazement. Recently I talked to an English woman, a specialist on the Soviet Union. She had returned from the May Day demonstration greatly upset. For some reason the TV decided not to show us the shameful ending of the May Day celebration, but the English woman got to see it. She was upset over the fact that there were speeches there of one extreme and the other extreme. She asked me: Why are sober-minded people silent? Why is the voice of reason hardly heard?

I believe that this is the foremost issue for our journalism. It says a lot in a heart-rending voice, but there really is no need to yell. We should talk quietly and contemplate our life as quietly as possible. Quite frequently journalism simply makes up for its lack of competence by way of this yelling. Journalism resorts to all kinds of what seem to be bright words in order to show how original it is when there are no new thoughts or facts, when there is nothing to say.

There are other reasons as well. There are voices of genuine hostility. But should we be feuding? So I propose that we discuss this topic: How should journalists facilitate the assertion of sober-mindedness in our country?

[Likhonov] I believe that our present-day journalism may be represented by a model of this auditorium. It is small in size, there are many people, and they do not necessarily hear everything at all times, but all of them in general want to express their point of view. You know, it seems to me that at present journalism is not a genre but our life itself. At present almost nobody is concerned about how things are written but rather about what is written. What is the root of all our troubles. I will discuss what I know best.

Perhaps the issue of mutual relations between ourselves and our own children should be one of the fundamental issues of our life. Who did we bring into the world and why? What is happening to them? What about their existence as proof of the legitimacy of our existence? I would like to say that we are embittered not only when it comes to, say, our neighbors but also when it comes to our own children. I have reliable statistics to back this up.

We now have as many orphans as after World War II, and 95 percent of these orphans have living parents. There are objective reasons—a difficult life and, so to say, morality aspects. A grown woman, herself a mother, kicks out a daughter who brought her “a bundle,” a grandson, because this was an unplanned and unneeded child not “backed up” by a father. Besides, pardon me for putting it like this, we no longer know how to create children. At present there are more than a million mentally retarded children in our country. An international Planned Parenthood association exists in the world. Do we understand the very combination of words “planned parenthood?”

The names of essayists who advocate a more perfect economy are well-known. However, could it happen that in our fighting over the future we could forget man and his ethical condition? After all, to my mind not even the strongest economy has protected the morals of people in any society. As a rule, such morality is protected by religion which has imparted an ethical element to the people and rules of coexistence and mutual relations among the people. By now all of this has been destroyed, or almost destroyed, in our country. This is why I would very much like to express concern about the status of the segment of journalism which should analyze the condition of not only the economy but also our souls.

[Vidrashku] We should instill respect for oneself, for one's own family and country, by means of journalism. Then we will be able to overcome the situation we are facing.

We are here together with Mikhail Filippovich Shatrov, and I will recall one of the episodes of our common work with him in NOVYY MIR. This was five years ago when perestroika began. He called me and said: “In 1969 my play ‘The Peace of Brest’ was accepted by the editorial board of NOVYY MIR and was rejected by the censors. How could we revisit this issue?” In one night I read this play, and the next night Sergey Pavlovich Zalygin did,

and it was published on the pages of NOVYY MIR and later played in many theaters of our country. It is from this—from respecting oneself, one's journal, and one's friend—that what we refer to by the word “perestroika,” perhaps somewhat overused by now, develops little by little.

Recently I read a caustic remark in a newspaper: “What has glasnost given us? Glasnost has given us the truth, more of the truth, and nothing but the truth.” I would say that I am very grateful for the truth which was given to us because we said a lot, a great deal of what was not true. Perhaps the truth and the purity of this very notion, this word, will help us make it out of this difficult situation.

[Shatrov] It also seems to me that we are now going through a critical moment in our life associated with the fact that the mess in the economy and in public life gives rise to attitudes which are, apparently, quite natural: We want order, we want calm! I am afraid that certain groups and people who dream about returning to the past may exploit this background. In times of uneasiness and this kind of alarm, this slogan always comes up: “It is necessary to consolidate our society.” However, my experience as a man who has devoted much time to studying history says that consolidation frequently comes through dictatorship. At present, the task for our country is to prove that consolidation can be achieved by democratic means.

I believe that tremendous responsibility now devolves on the intelligentsia which in many cities has come to the soviets, to the organs of power. Unless we come to an agreement on the most serious issues, even more uneasy days may come. In this sense I am profoundly upset by the fact that every time a remarkable event such as a party conference or party congress occurs in our society, some letter definitely appears in the press.

Before the conference a letter appeared from a Leningrad teacher which outlined quite precisely and clearly what it would be worthwhile for us return to. However, this was the letter of a teacher whereas at present I worry about how a new letter, this time signed by the USSR Central Committee, will be interpreted. These are remarkable and correct words; however, as soon as they get into certain kinds of hands they are interpreted in a certain way. I received calls almost every day from various cities of our country and was told how this letter was interpreted in the provinces. As I see it, the threat is real. If the letter is to be interpreted as a call to deal with dissenters—and very many people understood it exactly this way—I believe that the results we arrive at before the 28th congress of the party will not be gratifying. We have brought to an end the monopoly on power. I believe that we should also end the monopoly on thinking.

[Baklanov] Issue No. 2 of ZNAMYA has just been received in the outlying areas of our huge country, and they have been sending it back to us because it is bound improperly: a segment from one novel, then from

another, and so on. I asked what was happening. I was told: The Tyumen and Minsk printing plants took your publication "out of the goodness of their hearts," and they will give you up with pleasure. Meanwhile, the circulation of our magazine at present is 1 million copies. You see, there are no economic relations. Instead of asking "Give us a chance to make money," the printing plant says "We do not need this." Order can hardly be expected as long as it stays this way.

At the front line there were kind commanders. Say an infantry unit marched 70 kilometers and the people got tired. Making them dig foxholes for themselves was a cruel thing to do. There were kind commanders who did not make them do this, but the next morning those who had not dug foxholes were exposed to the bullets. Meanwhile, harsh commanders made people do it despite "I can't," but their men survived. At present we are facing approximately the same situation. When the current program of economic invigoration was put together journalists were told: Hold your criticism and let us work. Three months later it came out that in essence there is no program. The beauty of it is that they have finally understood that we have to switch to market relations; otherwise, nothing will work.

In this reference the following image occurs to me. For example, you have a tooth to extract. How is this to be done? Right away or should it be dragged out for a week? The tooth has got to be extracted right away! We need bold and firm decisions at present. We live in a very rich country in which, unfortunately, there has been no order thus far. This is our eternal issue. However, order is only possible if we have the wisdom to get together as we have today, and not to agitate and set ourselves against each other.

[Skatov] I happened to take part in a broadcast from the Ostankino TV center and a question was asked which seemed to predetermine my answer: Is Pushkin timely at present?

Everyone always says: Oh, is he not timely? I say that Pushkin is not timely because he is about harmony, whereas we stand for disharmony; because we have become evil and brutal, whereas Pushkin is virtue; because Pushkin is beauty, and what we have come to is an outrage. Besides, because the epoch of Pushkin is the most—if not the only—cultured epoch in the life of Russia, whereas at present we live in an epoch of lack of culture.

We have always heard that politics is virtually above all, and by now we have gotten used to this. Read the newspapers now: politicized masses, politicized people, the politicized country. There is nothing good about it! Or, at any rate, it is not good but ambiguous because frequently nothing underlies politicization. Unfortunately, we sometimes give the people who have yet to learn how to read books properly an opportunity to speak in the press and on television. Meanwhile, they

crave politics for which they are not quite prepared. As I see it, we have to get to politics through culture.

Our politics are often very superficial as well. So far, we have not excelled in what I would call the art of prediction. This is the case with our journalists and also our leaders. Some time ago an old literary specialist called the famous poem by Nekrasov, "Both Wretched and Abundant," our national anthem. This is what we are at present as well, both wretched and abundant, mighty and powerless Mother Russia.

If only we knew how to predict.... First, we get people hooked on alcohol, and then you cannot even get close to it to get a whiff. First, militiamen give a hard time to grannies selling dill spears, and then 20 billion rubles are siphoned off into cooperatives. Indeed, the art of prediction is what our journalism especially needs at present. Still, it derives from what could be called great culture in the true meaning of this word.

Indeed, we need both calm and order. In response we hear: "Oh yes, it is calm and order you want? Do you want to return to the past?" Why? We do not want a return to the past, all the more so because it was not all that calm and orderly. We want dignified calm and order. However, forgive me this banality, we will not achieve this in the absence of a great, varied, and comprehensive culture.

[Dedkov] As for me, I do not know how life can be predicted. I do not know how people can be taught how they should be living and what they should be engaging in at present. If the people are itching to engage in politics they should engage in politics—this means that this is the day, this time has come.

I prefer democracy to a dictatorship, and I believe that despite disgraceful things, difficulties, and torment, democracy is the road to freedom which, in general, we have come to miss and which was granted to us.

Indeed, we did not gain our freedom; it was granted to us. Literature and journalism have expanded the sphere of freedom. Unfortunately—the thought of it makes me sad—we have not been able, we have not learned how to use this freedom. Look how Russian writers and the Soviet writers of recent years yearned for this freedom! They yearned for it and dreamt of it. But when it came, when a basis for creativity and work emerged, it was as though nobody needed it. It seems to me that at present the tall weeds of lack of freedom are growing here. When people carry a banner with a slogan to the effect that our leaders should be moved from their chairs to plank beds, I also believe that these are the tall weeds of lack of freedom growing.

I think that there is so much simple hatred and a desire to bring about a split in our journalism. For several years you have been reading about a civil war in literature and society. One gets the impression that some people indeed want this. As they say, they are bringing it down on us and inflaming passions.

We may consider that Marxism contains a simplification of history and man. Many people share this point of view. Fine, we want to abandon all simplifications. However what do they offer us instead? We are offered a new simplification of man, a new simplification of history which is even more difficult, more frightening, and it seems to me even shameful. If we want to replace one simplification with another which is, on top of that, based on ethnic attributes, this will spell the collapse of our culture in general.

My comrade Vladimir Krupin is with me here in this auditorium. On one occasion we were in Novgorod with him; there I heard his presentations and I agreed 100 percent with what he said. However, recently I have read his publications in the newspapers and have frequently disagreed with some things.

However, recently I saw in PRAVDA a small note by V. Krupin which ends with words about writers being the conscience of the people. We have learned it well, we know it. To be sure, it is preferable for the people to call this or that writer their conscience rather than have the writers refer to each other as the conscience of the people. However, this is a remark in passing. I would like to mention something else. Krupin discussed how valuable a sober assessment of life is in our uneasy time. Once again, I agree 100 percent. I agree as to how important it is for a writer, a columnist, or a newspaper journalist to be circumspect with regard to his conclusions and rules.

I subscribe to the words of Krupin that writers should finally begin to work. At present, in the environment of freedom, it is objective and independent artists who feel the most uncomfortable. I will tell you who has now fallen out of favor more than anyone else in our literature—exactly the objective and independent artists. All the rest, those who yell and make noise, may even be favored.

[Yakovlev] When I was coming here I saw a presentation on TV in which the tasks of the press were discussed: first, to reflect the life of the people, and second, not to agitate our society. I will tell you that I do not agree with either the first or the second provision. The press has always been called a reflection of the life of the people. If it is a mirror, then it shows the agitation with which our present-day life overflows. To announce in early May that two weeks later a package of new economic reforms will come out and then, seeing the reaction, to say that it is postponed for half a year, is what agitating the people is all about. Unfortunately, as I see it agitation occurs not without the help of such measures by the government which, we might say, do not amount to much.

Secondly, I am profoundly convinced that the press cannot reflect the life of the people—this is not its task. It is its task to give the people reliable information. The people who have received information will decide themselves what to do with it.

We should say that recently we have made incredible advances along the road toward complete glasnost. I remember that it appeared to be virtually an exploit five years ago for the Moscow newspapers to report that a train accident occurred not only in America but in the Soviet Union as well. Now this does not impress anybody. Nonetheless, despite a very good system of glasnost having been already created, it fails every time when critical situations occur. Chernobyl came about and the press was either silent or provided incorrect information. The Tbilisi tragedy occurred—and the same thing happened. At present the events in Lithuania are under way and, for example, the TV is either silent or is providing prejudiced information, so to say, only the kind that suits it. Why is this happening, how is it possible? Because to this day a regular, alternative TV system has not been created in our country. Only an alternative press which has an opportunity to take its own position provides a guarantee of information being correct.

All of us awaited the Press Law, despite the fact that, to my mind, it will change little. Here is why. At one time Lenin said that there can be no freedom of the press there—meaning the West—because both the paper and the printing plants are controlled by monopolies. At present, this phrase applies to us because paper is controlled by the State Planning Committee which distributes it only to those it likes.

[Krupin] I can already see a decline in the interest of readers in the writings of journalists, and through the fault of journalists themselves at that, because man is not an end for a system, perhaps—regrettably—for any system, but a means. All the time they keep promising that we will live yet meanwhile we live beyond the brink. If you read our journalistic writings and watch TV without leaving home, it seems as bad as can be. When you come out into the street it is fine, the people are laughing.

At present the term "hard currency" is raging over the country like a whirlwind. Everyone craves hard currency, they cannot live without it.... Unfortunately, all they are beginning to expect of journalism are scandals.

So they organize meetings with readers, but one does not even want to go to them if for no other reason than because you keep seeing the same people who have waited long enough to get their scandal—boy, is it great! Somebody got under somebody else's skin, stung him so that it hurts, hit him—it is great! However, this is not normal. For example, what am I to contend for with those who are now sitting around this table with me? I do not want to stand to either the right or the left of them because, there is the notion of the land on which you were born, of the great power, the motherland, the state, the native land. I am grateful to Igor Dedkov for quoting me. After all, I will not lose my respect for him on account of statements with which I do not agree.

I look to the future with optimism. Everything is going to be all right, we will get by. The main point is not to stoop

to provocations and not to yell that a country like this, with a tremendous history and culture, is beginning to perish. This cannot be!

[Kozhemyako] They have referred to consolidation here. To my mind this is the main, most urgent, and fundamental thing which our society needs at present. Centrifugal forces in many spheres of life have become too powerful; they are altogether out of control. They should be overcome. But how? Does consolidation definitely amount to a dictatorship? No, I believe that we can achieve genuine national accord exactly by democratic means if we counter the pressure of aggressive extremes by a reasonable, thought-through policy aimed at a comprehensive improvement in our existence. Journalism may help substantially in this endeavor.

The following question arises: Is consolidation realistic in journalism itself? If some people mean a return to "complete unanimity" or, more precisely, the uniform thinking which we prided ourselves on at one time, then consolidation is, perhaps, not only unrealistic but extremely undesirable. All of us are different, thank God for that. However, different does not at all mean irreconcilable. We should strive for mutual understanding and should listen to each other.

Some time ago our life brought up the topic of the culture of discussion. This topic has not been ultimately exhausted by now because a lack of culture and even very real malice still abound in our publications. However, it appears to me that this malice is becoming somewhat spent. Let us wish for it to come to an end as soon as possible and for regular human conversation to triumph everywhere. I think that our meeting today shows that this exact kind of communication is possible.

We invite you, and all other essayists, to the pages of PRAVDA with your articles, dialogues, and essays, with topics which concern you the most and are important for the future of the country. At present PRAVDA is open to the most varied points of view, to statements marked by talent, no matter what school of journalism or literature they belong to, as long as they serve to create rather than destroy the new elements which our people regard as the future of the motherland.

We would like the "Essayist" Club to operate continuously on the pages of PRAVDA. We have topics to discuss, ideas to share, and things to argue about. Let us meet more often at festivals, and not only at festivals.

Lack of Supplies Disrupts Printing Houses

Delays Seen in Far East

90US10794 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Jun 90
Morning Edition p 4

[Report by V. Parkhayev, chief of an IZVESTIYA publishing house department: "No Zinc, No Newspapers"]

[Text] Khabarovsk—Soon the central newspapers, which for 20 years have been delivered to the Far East by facsimile [fototelegraf], will again be printed from matrixes using the old technology.

Fifty years ago the newspapers were delivered to the Far East by train, and in a best case scenario it took a week for them to arrive from Moscow. Ten years later they were being delivered by Aeroflot aircraft, and naturally delivery times were shortened. Then Khabarovsk started to receive ready matrixes using the same means, and to print the newspapers at the local printing house. This was a major advance: it was cheaper, faster, and more convenient. And in 1967-1970 central newspapers began to be transmitted by facsimile and people in the Far East could read PRAVDA and IZVESTIYA and other periodicals seven hours earlier than the Muscovites.

But today, 20 years later, Far Eastern readers of SELSKAYA ZHIZN, RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA, LESNAYA PROMYSHLENNOST, MEDITSINSKAYA GAZETA and the weekly FUTBOL-KHOKKEY are receiving their newspapers as before, printed from matrixes brought by air from Moscow. The delay is three days. Only PRAVDA, IZVESTIYA, TRUD, SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, and SOVETSKIY SPORT are being received by facsimile. And in another month or two these newspapers will be printed by the printing houses only from the matrixes.

What is the reason for this? In Khabarovsk the No. 1 Printing House is running out of the zinc plates needed for newspaper production. Without them it is impossible to make the print forms. Previously the zinc was obtained from Poland. Now it is no longer expected that this will be the case. In our country zinc plates are produced in Moscow. True, they are coarse-grained and less convenient for this than the Polish plates. But also they are not earmarked for Khabarovsk.

In late April the chief engineer at the printing house, A. Protsik, haunted the thresholds of the Moscow department for a whole week. He met with A. Smirnov, chief of the republic Committee for Publishing Houses, Printing Plants, and the Book Trade Material Resources Administration, and told him about the disastrous situation with the zinc. Aleksandr Borisovich threw up his hands: I cannot help in any way, he said. Poland is demanding hard currency for its zinc and we have none. The applicant from Moscow returned empty-handed.

Apart from zinc, the problem with nitric acid—without which the zinc plates cannot be etched—is also coming to a head. Previously the printing house used to obtain it from three enterprises in the country. Now, as a result of a fierce ecological struggle by the "Greens," these enterprises have been ordered to close down. And so the No. 1 Printing House in Khabarovsk, where the newspapers are printed for the kray and for Magadan and Kamchatka Oblasts, as well as some of the publishing houses for Sakhalin and the Maritime region, have no zinc or acid.

If the situation is not soon corrected the printing house will be forced to eliminate the zinc print shops while the kray communications administration will be forced to close the center where the newspapers are received by facsimile, and there can be no dream of restoring them. The specialists are looking for work elsewhere.

Ukraine Severely Affected

90US1079B Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian
19 Jun p 4

[Report by special correspondent N. Pugovitsa: "Why Are There No Newspapers?"]

[Text] Kiev—At the final meeting of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet session before its week-long break, republic Supreme Soviet Chairman V.A. Ivashko reported to deputies that the telephones installed in the building were overheating from all the calls being made by the inhabitants not only of Kiev but also of many of the oblasts. Those making the calls are outraged that this is now the third week that they have not been receiving a number of the popular central newspapers.

The telephone in the SELSKAYA ZHIZN newspaper office is red for the same reason. Since 1 June, subscribers in the Kiev forwarding zone—this is eight of the republic's oblasts—have not received a single issue of the newspaper, and this has evoked bewildered questions and discontent.

"There is just one reason—there is no paper," says A.G. Varenitsa, director of the "Radyanska Ukraina" Publishing House. "Printing of the central newspapers in our printing houses is supported by paper from the PRAVDA Publishing House stocks. Whereas previously we had a constant insurance reserve of 3,500 tons, which was enough for about one month, today there are barely enough reserves to print two issues of the republic newspapers. We have never had such trouble.

I went to the inspector of the PRAVDA Publishing House, A.V. Kayutkin, for an explanation.

"The USSR State Planning Committee is not allocating amounts that would support the print runs needed for the subscription lists. In May alone the Kondopoga Paper-and-Pulp Combine was 210 tons of paper short for production of the central newspapers. At first it was making it available to the "Radyanska Ukraina" publishing house but soon ran out. The PRAVDA publishing house now owes it 112 tons. Moreover, another 570 tons of paper are need to print the missed issues of PRAVDA, KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, SELSKAYA ZHIZN, and RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA."

"What are the prospects, Anatoliy Vladimirovich?"

"Very elusive. By the end of May we were receiving several freight cars a week, and they have become less frequent. The last freight car was dispatched from Kondopoga to Kiev on 9 June. Since then the combine has sent us nothing. But we need two freight cars—80 tons of

paper—each day to print the central newspapers. So you can judge the prospects for yourself."

Yes, the situation is critical. A blow has been struck at glasnost, and an appreciable blow. People's discontent continues to grow. Almost every telephone call brings the same question: Why is the government silent, is it looking for a solution to the situation?

Why indeed?

Russian Writers Describe Trip to U.S.

90UN2113A Moscow LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian No 21, 25 May 90 pp 18-19

[Unattributed article: "Russian Writers: First Impressions"]

[Text] Invited by the State Department (through the USIA program), Leonid Borodin, Pavel Gorelov, Stanislav Kunyayev, Viktor Likhonov, Oleg Mikhaylov, Svatoslav Rybas, Ernst Safonov, and Svetlana Selivanova spent a month in the United States.

Upon returning home, the delegation was received by U.S. Ambassador to the USSR Mr. J. Matlock who expressed satisfaction with the work that had been done, which contributed on the one hand to the writers' awareness of various sociopolitical aspects of life in the United States, and on the other to the strengthening of business ties between American and Soviet activists in culture and social movements.

"Well really, people, what are you talking about?"

"We heard for ourselves...."

"There was nothing of the kind."

"But we have heard, we heard from voices on the radio from 'the other side.' While you were in America they held you in police custody, in closed hotels, they picketed you and threw rocks at you...."

Oh, my God! Should we be indignant or just laugh—the latter is preferable.

This simply did not happen, although of course it would please certain people very much if it had.

We had not even set foot on U.S. soil before certain newspapers over there had already been blackened not with printers ink but from malice and hostility. Semen Reznik started it all with an article entitled "Landing Party of Soviet Nazis in Washington."

Biting, isn't it? "Landing Party... Nazis...."

Hold on, America!

And then came: "Russian nationalists profess fascism." "They are enemies of democracy." "Pamyat in New York...."

"On the whole this visit is not in the interests of the West," stated the president of the American Jewish Committee, David Harris. He was obsequiously seconded not by the "president" but by simply the "leader of the national American committee in defense of Soviet Jews," Martin Venik: "At the expense of American taxpayers eight dyed-in-the-wool chauvinists are taking a trip from one coast of America to the other...." Following the "leader," the "national director of the Union of Councils for Defense of Soviet Jewry," M. Naftalin: "The invitation (of these people) looks the same as, say, an invitation to a group of Ku Klux Klanners to discuss ethnic diversity in the American South." And finally, another "president" was given a chance to speak—Alexander Schneider, now president of the Union of American Jewish Congregations: "It is disturbing that the taxpayers are paying for all this...."

Let us interrupt him and ask: For what?

For the opportunity granted to us by the United States to talk to Americans about the current "restructured" life in the Soviet Union, about the complicated events related to the reform that are taking place in Russia, about our efforts for Russia's spiritual renewal, about our concerns and hopes in such a difficult time for the country. For the fact, finally, that we were given the opportunity to study the instructive experience of the United States—from the example of various states in the north and the west, in the east and the south—in the development and strengthening of state national-ethnic relations.

But the newspapers, led by NOVOYE RUSSKOYE SLOVO, shouted:

"...during the years of glasnost and perestroika Russian nationalists of all stripes are trying to merge into a single consolidated group. They are united by their nostalgia for the 'strong fist,' their hatred for Jews, and their panicky fear in the face of democracy"; "...they are lusting for power. They already have two of their own representatives in Gorbachev's 'Presidential Council'—the writer Valentin Rasputin and the worker Veniamin Yarin..." and so forth and so on.

This might all be called stupidity were it not for one other thing which is clear—the scheme they have in mind, the provocation intended to dupe the Americans is by no means stupid.

The stir in the press was not enough—an incident was arranged which was practically identical to the one that occurred at the Central House of Writers, but the overseas version. In order not to distort anything unwittingly (I was not an eye witness), I shall quote the almost rapturous description from this same NOVOYE RUSSKOYE SLOVO from 11 May:

"In an interview with a NOVOYE RUSSKOYE SLOVO correspondent, the 28-year-old Levi, who describes himself as a 'bookkeeper and a part-time revolutionary,' stated that members of his organization are followers of

the Russian Zionist Vladimir (Zeyev) Zhabotinskiy who called for the Jews to form self-defense detachments after the Kishinev pogrom. 'As long as it is unsafe for Jews to walk down the streets of Leningrad it will be unsafe for Russian Nazis to walk down the streets of New York!' declared Levi.

"Yesterday morning Levi and four members of the OZE (Organization for Protection of Jews—ed.) tried, in his words, to break off the meeting between the delegation of writers and representatives of the National Conference of Christians and Jews. Five demonstrators shouting the slogans 'Kunyayev is a Nazi,' 'Nazis go home!' and 'Jews should not meet with Nazis' went up to the 11th floor of the building where the meeting took place but were stopped by a thick glass door. As Levi says, during this incident the demonstrators hit somebody in the face, although the victim turned out to be not one of the Russian writers but an American. Levi remarked about this that 'hypocritical Americans who rub shoulders with Nazis' are even worse than the latter.

"You have a long list of enemies," noted the author of these lines. 'Yes, and it is growing every day and every hour,' laughed Levi against whom a suit had been brought for a shooting in Greenwich Village last year...."

As you can see, the "result" of the Central House of Writers incident is the same "trophy": "They hit somebody in the face," they probably broke his glasses—in general this is something for the whole world to be alarmed about!

In irritation—more impassioned from issue to issue!—NOVOYE RUSSKOYE SLOVO has already asked in what they call an open text:

"But here is the question: Why were namely Kunyayev, Safonov, and Mikhaylov invited? Why were they trusted to represent the Russian people and not, say, Gavril Popov and Yury Afanasyev...?"

In brief, the wrong ones were named.

And indeed—why?

I just shrug my shoulders.... Let whoever knows give the answer. I do not know. Should we ask the U.S. Government? The Russian people?

But this is a pointless charade: Who is "one of us" and who is "not one of us."

Perhaps only the statements published in NOVOYE RUSSKOYE SLOVO will shed a certain amount of light. Here are two of them, printed right next to each other in the section entitled "Khronika":

"Invitation to Demonstration

"On Wednesday, 9 May, at 7 p.m. in front of the Summit Hotel in Manhattan on the corner of Lexington Avenue and 51st Street, there will be a protest demonstration

against the visit to the United States—at the expense of American taxpayers—of a group of Soviet nationalist writers.

"Everyone interested is invited to the demonstration."

"Literary Gathering

"On Thursday, 10 May, at 7:30 in the evening in the Strelets Literary Center there will be a gathering in which the Leningrad poet Aleksandr Kushner and the Moscow literary scholar and commentator Natalya Ivanova will participate.

"Admission is free. Before the meeting it will be possible to acquire books from the Third Wave publishing house at a 60-percent discount."

Of course I guess it would be preferable to go to the literary gathering: People were attracted by a sale of a commodity which, even if it is unmarketable, is being sold with a large discount—60 percent. They are almost giving it away. But do they pay to stage protests and rallies? As we have seen in the photographs, in front of the hotel in which the Russian writers were not even staying there was a pathetic little group of "chosen ones" and according to the placard in the hands of a gentleman with a puffy face—"Sharikov's children out of New York!"—we were almost glad to guess that these were our own, our own compatriots from yesterday, from the Arbat or Krasnaya Presnya—and may God judge them....

We quickly understood that meetings with the majority of journalists would produce nothing: They were working according to a previously determined plan—defamation and a lack of desire to listen to us. It was not enough that they misquoted us in a defamatory way—in addition they brazenly attributed to us things we did not even say. For example, in Epstein's article: "Safonov resolutely added...." But Safonov was "resolutely" not in attendance at that meeting.

All we did was state at a press conference that when discussing all the current difficulties in Russia we see no need to discuss the "Russian-Jewish question" as the main one; in an atmosphere of aggravation of interethnic tension in the USSR it is not singled out from the other issues—"Russian-Lithuanian," "Russian-Moldavian," "Russian-Caucasian." Thank God there are no Jewish pogroms in Russia; the Russians not only do not want them—they will not allow them. Rumors about pogroms are deliberately exaggerated by the same provocateurs, and now it would more just to devote attention to the thousands upon thousands of refugees from the republics that are experiencing incredible need while the government attitude toward them is cool. As soon as we said this we were dubbed by the newspapers "anti-Semites," "godfathers of Pamyat," and "racists" since we spoke "of the Jewish issue as one of many" and "deliberately played down the real state of affairs."

Just like that—upside down!

Reading all these lies I would still—with sorrow and shame for their creators—like to exclaim: "God, can they really do this? Should there not be a limit?"

In one of the states, Montana, there were some timid people: Frightened by the journalists, they refused to meet with us. And they were straightforward: Who wants to sit down to a cup of coffee with "dyed-in-the-wool chauvinists"! In other states, on the contrary, they waited for us impatiently and with good wishes, knowing full well, as one might guess, the price it cost certain publications in their country, the more so since not all newspapers were so unrestrained—many articles were objective and respectful, especially in the local press.

We were comforted by a confession heard at a meeting in the House of Representatives of the Congress: "No matter what you may say or how you may speak about ethnic Russian issues, it will be met with a lack of understanding or even hatred in certain of our circles and part of our press...."

We were also comforted by something else. The Americans have a strongly developed sense of pride in their country and a feeling of respect for the U.S. flag, and all symbols that designate landmarks in the history and the current democratic principles of America. We were constantly hearing them say, sometimes in an inappropriate place, but seriously and with a great deal of dignity: "I am an American." "Ours is the most free country in the world...." And could people with such a high degree of national patriotic spirit really not understand us—with our love for our long-suffering country, with our fear for its future? They understood, displaying genuine interest in all that is happening in Russian during the hard days of its national optimistic drama.

The concept "American" did not contradict the concept "Russian." And of course, this has nothing to do with nationality or "pure blood"—this is about belonging to the state, to the land on which you were born and which stands behind you. This is about the very national patriotism which is honored in any country and is protected by the law—in the United States, England, and France—but is subjected to sly ridicule, is disparaged, and is doubted as a healthy moral feeling only in Russia of our day. Calling us "nationalists" as usual and presenting Russian writers as such to the Americans, Semen Reznik and other glib apprentices of the writing trade, having abandoned Russia and found shelter in generous America, it seems have missed it by a mile: What is hateful to them is perceived quite differently by newspaper readers who recognize, as we do, their state and national dignity.

And we are grateful to the USIA, the State Department, and the U.S. Embassy in the USSR for allowing us to travel free and unencumbered on the country's roads and airways, to visit the most various kinds of places, and to experience daily life in America and the well moderated energy of its political dictatorship in the world. They did not expect from us praise and recognition of the justice

of America, they did not conceal from us if you will their aggressiveness (in concerns about themselves and the nation's future they are aggressive)—they simply showed us openly how and with what modern America lives in the entire complex of its own difficult problems. Not heaven on our imperfect earth—it is a developed state with a well-arranged structure.

America is like a tightly compressed spring: It skillfully pushes people upward to success and well-being, but at the same time one must be on guard so that they do not let up and get off the track and lose their steam.... This is why when Americans are working they place business above everything else, they value the position they have won in their work, they keep track of their health, and during hours of recreation they can have fun without any cares. When everything with you is "Okay" you yourself are happy and not worthless.

I am leafing through my notepad and the hastily written lines come alive with the voices of those I met. In the House of Representatives of Congress; in the Supreme Court; in the states of Pennsylvania, Ohio, and West Virginia; in the universities; in the Pittsburgh Jewish Community Center (this is where we should learn to raise children!); in the states of Iowa and Arizona; in the state of Illinois where we stayed with local farmers ("Greetings, dear Peter and Becky Dowley, I am already home!..."); another university—now Mississippi; in the very picturesque San Francisco; the Hopi Indian reservation...in Washington; dozens of small cities; in New York...I cannot list it all. A notepad is a register, but memory is the attitude of your heart. Heart and consciousness—they define my attitude toward everything that occurred on the trip during the month.

It is my firm conviction that we left America as friends of the Americans.

We believe in them, in their openness, and their desire for friendship and cooperation.

Their smiles and approving words frequently seemed like apologies for the coordinated psychological onslaught by part of the press.

This onslaught was dirty foam but there was also a clean broad expanse of smooth water.... It elucidated the usefulness and mood of our trip.

And what was also a joy were the unforgettable meetings with "Russian Americans," respected senior citizens from the first wave of emigration and their children, emigrants of the "second wave"—all those Russian patriots who during the years of trouble were forced to go across the ocean and to this day hold sacred the idea of Russia and the purity of the Russian language and the Russian culture, although in advanced years were born abroad and had never been in the Russian lands. The Russian Orthodox Church in exile, with whose clergy we formed a close bond—and nothing can separate us from one another—has been and is for the Russian people a center of unification and unity. These people, just as in

America they preserve the Orthodox temples and Russian cemeteries, have saved invaluable documentary evidence from the prerevolutionary history of the Russian state and the time of the civil war—that same objectively correct evidence which at certain times was destroyed in our country in a planned and cruel way. We bow deeply to this selfless devotion.

I hope there will be articles, essays, and discussions of what we have seen, names will be given, and we shall recall interesting and significant cases from our travel through the United States; in brief, each will write about his "discovery of America".... Everything lies ahead. And this is my first reaction upon returning to Russia—what needed to be said at the outset in order to make things clear. [Signed] Ernst Safonov

First Impressions

Lines written by the writers at the request of the LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA editor in chief on board the airliner that flew from New York to Moscow.

Stanislav Kunyayev:

The discovery of America is an entire drama for every thinking person. The superhuman power of material forces: the abundance of steel, glass, sparkling automobiles; produce wrapped in cellophane and plastic are striking, just as is the endless quantity of equally carefully prepared and packaged legal, state, and religious norms, rules, and codes.... Do we have room for such an endless diversity of civilization? Should we? This thought was constantly in my head.... And suddenly in Pittsburgh, in the ethnic center, I heard ideas that gladdened the Russian soul: America passed its national assimilative peak in the thirties and now there is again a rise in ethnic self-preservation. The idea of the melting pot is becoming a thing of the past and it is being replaced by an ever more persistent—like grass coming up through asphalt—idea that democratic fraternity does not rule out but hungers for national diversity. Against the background of this discovery, the increasingly ardent volleys from the American press against our Russian nationalism have been dispelled like smoke in discussions with normal, sound-minded Americans—white, black, red, and yellow. "Do not listen to the journalists," they said, "we are the real America."

Viktor Likhonosov:

This will remain with me forever: Elderly Russian people drive up to the hotel in their cars and take us off either to church or to the Russian club or to a dining table in someone's home. We come in, we kiss, then we hear: "Gentlemen, let us pray." We sit down to the table and spend three or four hours talking and feeling as though we were in old Russia. We were born too late but we get used to the forgotten customs quickly, like natives.

"How can we help you? What can we do for Russia?" they asked us.

"Come and visit us," we answered. "Help our rebirth, come to Russia by the paths which perhaps you know. Come more often to the land your ancestors lost."

We visited a cemetery in the state of New Jersey where A.L. Tolstaya, R.B. Gul, Kolchak's son, the Cossack General Maumenko, and the Cossacks and officers of His Majesty's convoy are buried. The old people were our guides. We went along and did not look at one another; a sense of the Russian misfortune united us. But everywhere, everywhere we heard: "Our grandfathers and our fathers have educated us and we live with a faith in Russia. In that which, like Kitezh, has disappeared under water."

Svyatoslav Rybas:

1. My main impression is that the United States takes seriously the idea of the rebirth of Russia, seeing in this idea the natural continuation of our historical development. Meetings in the State Department, in the universities with politicians, political scientists, and journalists showed the depth of this interest. Of the eight large articles in newspapers, five supported our trip and three did not. But serious thought about what would come "after communism" in Russia and the destiny of the great country with the tragic fate engages part of the American public only on a narrow plane: Russian rebirth is linked to chauvinism and organizations like Pamyat. Of course, they took advantage of the fact-juggling in the well-known "Letter" from 74 writers. I think to speak of the current position of the Russian people and at the same time to speak about the battle against Zionism would not be the most fruitful kind of discussion. It was this kind of juggling of facts that sometimes became the main subject in our discussions in the United States.

Another impression has to do with Russian Americans. Especially the youth: Masha Belyayeva from San Francisco and Mikhail and Pavel Khlebnikov from New York....

There was also the readiness to help Russia. The 82-year-old Archpriest Mitrofan Znosko-Borovskiy donated a large sum for the restoration of the Temple of Christ the Redeemer....

Another thing was the freedom of the farmers and the "Stolypin-like" path of agriculture: bitterness about our unsolved problems....

And the hope that Russia and America will finally be able to understand one another.

2. Those who arranged our trip—the U.S. Embassy in Moscow and the United States Information Agency—set the goal of trying to establish new approaches. Russia has existed for a thousand years and to replace it with the nonnational communist ideal, which is in a state of deep crisis—this is not the policy for today.

We convinced the American public that Russia, once restored, will bring peace and harmony to the world. And they understood us.

Svetlana Selivanova:

The melodiously sparkling Chicago airport, the brilliant variety of colors of New York, the fantastic bridges of San Francisco, the store shelves weighed down under their abundant load—in a certain sense America was one of the prototypes of the future of mankind. It feels as though before our eyes, with our participation as witnesses, a new computerized miracle of civilization....

America rushes, hurries, advertises, competes; the rhythm of daily life gains speed every second; it is equipped with newer and newer technical improvements—electronics are invading every home: buttons, levers, switches.... Is this the good life?!

But still this is not life. America gathers its historical memory. It structures its past. It thinks in the perspective of large time. America is learning to take pride in its fathers and grandfathers, understanding that the sense of its own worth is acquired only through its roots in history. A person who respects his past and reveres his ancestors cannot be hostile to other peoples—this is how Joseph Makarevich, director of the Center for Ethnic Studies, formulated its goal.

The true face of America was opened up to me in spite of the revelations of our home-grown so-called American experts who just yesterday were frightening us with the "face of hatred" from across the ocean. And this was possibly the main result and lesson of our trip. Communication with the world without ideologically prejudiced intermediaries—this is the only thing that can give people the opportunity to hear and understand one another.

And I am convinced that this understanding, this truly human contact between us and the Americans, has appeared.

It has arisen in spite of all the attempts on the part of some of the American press to prevent its happening.

Having attached well-known labels to certain members of our delegation, the "inter-journalists" became so overly zealous that perhaps it worked against them. Certain of their articles, like a magic wand, opened up to us the doors to the most interesting institutions and homes of America. The boomerang effect worked well! At the same time it enabled us to see the problems and difficulties encountered today by both the American government and the ordinary American. But this experience, acquired so unexpectedly, must be assimilated.

In general there is much to assimilate. And above all we must assimilate the processes taking place today in my homeland. Paradoxical as it may be, they can be seen much more clearly and distinctly from faraway America.

But this is a subject for a special discussion.

28 June Aircraft Hijack Attempt Thwarted

PM0307091390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
 29 Jun 90 Second Edition p 8

[Report by USSR KGB Public Relations Center:
 "Unsuccessful"]

[Text] An attempt to hijack a Tu-154 aircraft on flight No. 3594 on the Krasnodar-Orenburg-Krasnoyarsk route was successfully thwarted 28 June.

Approximately 1 hour 15 minutes after the aircraft had taken off from Krasnodar, one of the passengers handed the crew a note demanding that they fly to Turkey. If the demand was not met he threatened to use a toxic substance.

The crew members assessed the situation realistically and, displaying courage, entered into conversation with the hijacker. Meanwhile communication was established with Orenburg airport where the forces and facilities used in such cases were made ready. At 1602 hours the aircraft landed at Orenburg. A few minutes later the hijacker was rendered harmless and arrested. He turned out to be Yuriy Yuryevich Kapirushov, born in 1973, a student at the Krasnoyarsk vocational and technical college. The KGB directorate for Orenburg Oblast has initiated criminal proceedings against him and an investigation is under way.

None of the passengers or crew members was harmed. The aircraft was commanded by Pilot First Class Viktor Aleksandrov.

Central Committee Greets Institute Graduates

PM0207120190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
 22 Jun 90 Second Edition p 1

[Undated CPSU Central Committee greetings message:
 "To Graduates of the CPSU Central Committee Social Sciences Institute"]

[Text] Dear comrades!

The CPSU Central Committee cordially congratulates you on your graduation from the institute.

You are graduating on the eve of a most important event in the life of the party and the entire country—the 28th CPSU Congress. The congress will outline the program for the further restructuring, renewal, and improvement of our Soviet society; adopt the new party statutes; and define the party's place and role under the new conditions.

Objective opportunities have today emerged for mankind to enter a fundamentally new, peaceful period in its history. We are proceeding on the basis that Soviet policy in the international arena accords with both the interests of Soviet people and other peoples' vital interests.

The CPSU will continue to consistently advocate equal cooperation and close international collaboration among all workers, left-wing democratic parties, and progressive and peace-loving movements and organizations. We highly value the fraternal parties' solidarity with our country and with perestroika—solidarity which is designed to rid socialism of alien accretions.

We believe in the socialist ideal and the socialist option, and we closely link them with our adherence to common human values and the world community's unchanging desire for security and progress.

We wish you, dear comrades, good health, happiness, and success in your activity for the benefit of working people and for the sake of peace, democracy, and socialism!

[Signed] The CPSU Central Committee

Boris Yeltsin's Book To Be Serialized

PM0207181590 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA
 PRAVDA in Russian 24 Jun 90 p 2

[I. Shestopalov, chief editor of KOMSOMOLSKAYA ZHIZN, reply to reader's question; first two paragraphs are a reader's letter: "Is it Time for Memoirs?"]

[Text] I have seen a report stating that a book by B.N. Yeltsin has been published in our country. When will it be available at book stores?

[Signed] M. Krupiy, Tula.

This is what we were told by I. Shestopalov, chief editor of KOMSOMOLSKAYA ZHIZN, journal of the Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] Central Committee.

"The title of B. Yeltsin's book is "Confession on a Set Subject" [Isповed na Zadannuyu Temu]. It is neither his memoirs nor a political study. It is a sort of self-portrait in the light of our complex times. The book has been published in Riga and Sverdlovsk in a total print run of 400,000 copies. So the chances of finding it in a book store are slim. With the author's permission, the journal KOMSOMOLSKAYA ZHIZN will begin publishing the "Confession..." as from August. You can try and read the book there. Incidentally, subscription for August ends 30 June."

Obituary for Nuclear Physicist I.M. Frank

PM0207120790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
 25 Jun 90 Second Edition p 8

[Obituary of Academician Ilya Mikhaylovich Frank]

[Excerpts] The fatherland's science has suffered a heavy loss. Academician Ilya Mikhaylovich Frank, the famous Soviet physicist, Nobel Prize winner, and holder of the USSR state prize, passed away 22 June 1990.

I.M. Frank was born 23 October 1908 in Petersburg. In 1930 he graduated from Moscow University Physical Mathematics Faculty. An important stage of his subsequent activity in the State Optics Institute, and later in the USSR Academy of Sciences P.N. Lebedev Physics Institute, was closely linked to the school of Academician S.I. Vavilov whom he considered his teacher and deeply respected and loved.

I.M. Frank's main scientific achievements which won him world renown relate to the coherent interaction of rapidly charged particles with matter. It was in this sphere, which in the thirties was considered to be on the border between optics and nuclear physics, that I.M. Frank made outstanding discoveries. He revealed the physical nature of Vavilov-Cherenkov luminescence, and together with I.Ye. Tamm he invented in 1937 the quantum theory of effect. For the investigation of this phenomenon I.Ye. Tamm, I.M. Frank, and P.A. Cherenkov were awarded the Nobel Prize for Physics in 1958.

Another sphere of Academician I.M. Frank's scientific interests was neutron physics—the interaction of neutrons with matter. His work made a substantial contribution to the development of this branch of nuclear physics and had not only a purely scientific but also a more applied significance, notably toward the solution of the problem of the atom. [passage omitted]

[Signed] M.S. Gorbachev, L.N. Zaykov, Yu.D. Maslyukov, V.A. Medvedev, N.I. Ryzhkov, A.N. Yakovlev, E.M. Primanov, O.D. Baklanov, I.T. Frolov, Yu.A. Osipyan, O.S. Belyakov, A.S. Kapto, G.I. Marchuk, Zh.I. Alferov, E.P. Velikhov, N.P. Laverov, A.A. Logunov, G.A. Mesyats, N.M. Makarov, A.M. Baldin, N.G. Basov, S.T. Belyayev, N.N. Bogolyubov, B.L. Ginzburg, L.V. Kaldysh, M.A. Markov, A.M. Prokhorov, D.V. Skobel'syn, A.N. Skrinskiy, A.E. Chudakov, G.N. Flerov, Yu.B. Khariton, E.L. Feynberg, I.S. Shapiro.

Soviet 'Who's Who in World Politics' Published

LD0207130190 Moscow TASS in English 1258 GMT 2 Jul 90

[Text] Moscow July 2 TASS—The Soviet Union has published its first Who's Who in World Politics reference book.

The book contains data about state, political and religious figures, diplomats, businessmen and other famous names.

It includes more than 1,500 biographical entries.

Economic

Gosplan Head Interviewed on Economic Situation

PM0307080790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Jun 90 Second Edition pp 2,6

[Interview with Yu.D. Maslyukov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR

Gosplan, by unidentified correspondent; place and date unspecified; under the rubric "Interview Before the 28th CPSU Congress": "Resolve and Balance Needed"]

[Text] [PRAVDA] Yuriy Dmitriyevich! You recently became a Politburo member. What do you consider the most important aspect of your new job? What issues have you personally succeeded in resolving?

[Maslyukov] Being elected to the Politburo is a great vote of confidence for any communist. The Politburo's sphere of activity currently covers essentially all the fundamental issues of social and state life. This does not mean, of course, that the Politburo resolves these issues on behalf of the Supreme Soviet, the Congress of People's Deputies, or the government. Although in the past and even at the start of my work that used to happen quite often. Today that has been done away with. Each person must do their own job.

What is the most important aspect for me? I would answer this question as follows: the opportunity to look at the economy in the context of politics and to link up politics and economics. Genuinely revolutionary perestroika is under way in this area today. PRAVDA readers are well aware of the discussions under way in society about this truly topical problem.

A decision to make a fundamental break with an old system in all its components is not easy and cannot be made overnight. Proposals are still being submitted—both from government circles and from local level—to return to the old, strictly centralized, administrative system which alone is thought to be capable of stabilizing the situation. But I am profoundly convinced that this position is a dead end. In this connection the question was raised of accelerating the transition to regulated market relations, relying on the principles of the government program to improve the country's economy. The government has created and presented to the country's Supreme Soviet a concept for switching to a regulated market economy.

Currently we are at the very start of this hard road. That is why it is premature to talk about any results just now. But I am convinced that this choice is the right one. The system of state regulation should correspond to the new conditions and be flexible, democratic, and adapted as far as possible to the demands of the market economy. Everything that can be resolved locally—at enterprises and in cities, rayons, oblasts, krays, and republics—should not be the concern of the center. It will determine the goals and tasks for the country's development and the questions of elaborating a system of economic regulators—that is taxes, prices, credit, and others. It will shoulder concern for defense, the social protection of citizens, and the development of major infrastructure projects.

[PRAVDA] Does this mean that such a plan should be a regulator rather than an order or a directive?

[Maslyukov] Yes, the main function is to create the necessary economic conditions of free, entrepreneurial labor for the main economic component (the enterprise). This is the most important provision of the economic reform. On the basis of the equality of all forms of ownership, enterprises will have every opportunity to develop their business independently and to deal with virtually all the output they produce. In this respect it is very important that the diktat of the dismantled administrative-edict system should not be replaced by the diktat of republic and local authorities. The ideology of the transition to regulated market relations is feasible only in the context of the full autonomy of economic units within an all-Union market system. A clear understanding of this fundamental issue does not yet exist. Here too a decisive role should be played by the Law on Enterprises in the USSR recently adopted by the Supreme Soviet.

Of course, these are only individual elements in the new economic system, and I will have to constantly participate in their elaboration and substantiation. And this is the main aspect of my activity. I would note that the entire government is engaged in work that is vast in terms of its scale and importance. A whole series of laws defining the future economy have already been elaborated, and a great deal more will have to be done. It is now very important that the activity of republic governments, local soviets, and enterprises moves in the direction of the practical implementation of existing laws.

[PRAVDA] What decisions in the sphere of economic policy in recent years would you consider mistaken, and for which ones were you responsible?

[Maslyukov] Practice has shown that, given the lack of a developed economic and legal infrastructure, and of laws and norms regulating the activity of production collectives, many measures to expand the autonomy of enterprises and to narrow the impact of the plan on the economy following the 1987 decisions have not borne fruit.

On the long and hard road to the market, the first thing we did under the pressure of economic science was to scrap many planning measures for influencing production processes—above all, at the sectorial level. Controls on remuneration funds were lifted on the basis of the same recommendations. At the same time, the economic levers needed to develop the market had been only slightly brought into action. As a result, the abolished forms of state plan and administrative influence on production—particularly with regard to intrasectorial balance and staffing—were not replaced by economic regulators.

Consequently a situation was created in which we had neither a plan nor a market. An administrative vacuum emerged—put more simply, it was economic anarchy. For a while the national economy developed through inertia, but stoppages in production began to happen more and more often.

Suffice it to say that as of the start of this year the country was working not on the state plan ratified by the USSR Supreme Soviet and the government, but on the basis of a summary of enterprise plans. What is the difference between them? The difference is that the level of national income has turned out to be 12 billion rubles [R] lower than planned in the official plan document. Hence the previous slowdown in economic growth has been replaced by a fall-off in the absolute size of social production.

But a quite different situation is emerging with regard to the growth of the population's monetary income. This increased by R105 billion—or 23 percent—in 1988-1989. Previously such a growth in the population's monetary income would have taken seven years. Even the most vigorous efforts in consumer goods production and importation could not counteract such an unprecedented surge of money in circulation. All this resulted in the catastrophic disorganization of the domestic market. Virtually all goods, with very few exceptions, are in short supply. All this makes people lack confidence in the future, generates alarm, and produces the phenomenon of the "flight from money"—that is, the desire to exchange money for any kinds of goods, even those which under different conditions nobody would accept.

I think that the difficulties we are experiencing are also happening because the elective nature of enterprise leaders declared from above has played a negative role. Normal work largely depends on the organizational qualities and competence of its leaders. The practice of the elections has shown that in many cases directors' chairs have been filled by people unable to properly manage work but capable of playing on the labor collective's immediate interests. This has been one of the main reasons behind the disorganization of the labor process, the fall-off in output production, the deterioration in output quality, and the failure to fulfill contractual deliveries.

At the same time, it seems to me that everything negative we have at the moment stems not from the scale and nature of production potential or from the volume of resources or cadre qualification, but from the forms and methods of disorganized management.

Of course, as a government member I am responsible for these shortcomings. But I must say that for my part I have always striven to propose solutions which would channel economic processes in the necessary direction. After being appointed chairman of the USSR Gosplan [State Planning Committee] in 1988 and becoming a Central Committee Politburo member in 1989, I directly participated in initiating the formation of the economic improvement program examined at the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies, as well as the concept for switching to regulated market relations put forward at the recent USSR Supreme Soviet session.

Can we talk about mistakes made in these documents? As far as the concept of the switch to market relations is

concerned, it will be finalized in accordance with the recommendations of the USSR Supreme Soviet—with regard to the plan for 1990 I would like to emphasize that I cannot see the slightest significant economic shortcoming in it. I would like to recall that, in defending the plan for 1990 and the economic improvement program, the government—myself included—persistently stressed that the successful implementation of these plans would only be possible under the conditions of the full consolidation of working people and sociopolitical stability. But, as you know, this did not come about. Ethnic and labor conflicts flared up which destabilized the economy.

So what was our shortcoming? Above all, I think, the fact that we developed the 1990 plan and the improvement program without taking sufficient account of the sociopolitical situation in the country. Clearly, we are only just learning to correlate our economic plans and calculations with the political situation.

[PRAVDA] How do you, Yuriy Dmitriyevich, assess society's reaction to the measures proposed by the government for the switch to a market economy? How do you view the political consequences of the new economic strategy?

[Maslyukov] Society's reaction to the government's proposals on the transition to a market economy has been ambiguous. Some people are clearly against the introduction of market relations. However, in our assessment most people are in favor of the market—the question is merely about the way in which the transition to market relations should be implemented. Some people are simply scared of the future. After all, it means rejecting the familiar and decades-old way of life of our society and every Soviet citizen. This way of life has been criticized by virtually everyone on account of the shortages, the disorganization of the consumer and housing markets, the disruption in production, the continuing recurrences of administrative management methods, the inadequate economic autonomy enjoyed by enterprises, and much else besides.

At the same time, everyone realizes that this way of life provided people—albeit at a very modest level—with a certain amount of stability. Whatever the state of production, no enterprise would go bankrupt—and that meant that everyone was guaranteed work and a steady, if not large, income. The state was obliged to provide everyone with housing, and even if the housing lists were slow-moving everyone knew who was to blame and who needed to be approached in order to ultimately obtain an apartment. Medical aid and education was accessible to all.

And now it is proposed that we abandon this familiar way of life for the sake of switching to a society in which each person's prosperity will depend to a considerably greater extent on themselves. Initially it is objectively possible that there will be price rises, it is inevitable that some enterprises which are working poorly will go bankrupt, that production volumes will fall, and—this is the

most undesirable point—that the living standards of certain categories of working people may quite possibly fall.

It is quite natural that this is causing a certain amount of hesitation, doubt, and—let's be blunt—distrust and rejection of the proposed reforms in society. It is under these difficult conditions that the government now has to defend and implement its program.

What, in my view, is the way out of this situation? Above all we must be exceedingly frank in explaining to people the specific forms, methods, and consequences of the transition to the market. And it is entirely necessary that all the possible options for the transition be examined and discussed. All the Union and autonomous republics must absolutely take part in this work. It will be simply impossible to switch to market relations without winning the population's confidence or achieving national consensus on this issue.

But if we do win the people's confidence in implementing this economic strategy and if we get through the difficult transitional period, then the political consequences strike me as being very favorable.

The all-Union market will be a kind of uniting factor which will replace administrative methods. After all, our economy and the economies of all the Union republics are strongly integrated. This objective integration can no longer be maintained by administrative means. It is administrative methods that are currently fostering centrifugal forces, whereas a well-organized and normally functioning market could generate healthy centripetal forces. Both ethnic and social conflicts could be smoothed out on this basis.

[PRAVDA] Doesn't the transition to the market mean a complete rejection of centralized planning, Yuriy Dmitriyevich?

[Maslyukov] Undoubtedly not. I consider it necessary to state my personal attitude to the problem of retaining centralized state influence over the course of expanded reproduction under market conditions. I think that the question is now not merely of practical but of profoundly philosophical party importance.

The very nature of productive forces insistently demands that the state participate in the organization of social production and make maximum use of all the useful points accumulated by Soviet planning. We should not view centralized planning as an attribute of the administrative-edict system. The essence of the matter is different. It is the command system that emasculated the most vital and effective aspects of planning, utilized the planning system for the purposes of exerting severe pressure on labor collectives, deprived it of its scientific content through subjective and willful approaches, and distorted its methods. The task now is to restore the true face of planning and place it at the service of efficient economic development. World experience shows that—even under the conditions of market relations—

economic regulation, the targeted development of society's productive forces, and the active utilization of economic methods for influencing key national economic spheres in order to achieve common state goals remains a most important state function.

A fundamentally new and flexible mechanism should be created to ensure collaboration between state centralized planning and planning at grass-roots level—at enterprise and regional level. This planning will be sensitive to consumer interests and market conditions.

This principled approach toward the utilization of centralized planning methods under the conditions of a regulated market determines the possibility of implementing our socialist choice to the full.

[PRAVDA] What tasks, Yuriy Dmitriyevich, face the USSR Gosplan in the immediate future?

[Maslyukov] On the basis of the tasks of regulating market relations a leading place in the Gosplan's activity should be taken up above all by the social aspects of our development. The impact of scientific and technical progress as well as the market on the needs of society and the population and their demands on the structure of production; working people's qualifications; the problems of employment; the population's social protection; the comparison of living standards between regions; population migration; housing construction; and social services—that is by no means a complete list of the issues which the Gosplan will have to thoroughly tackle under the new conditions. It will be necessary to develop social programs that will allow people to have equal opportunities for work and spiritual development and permit them to satisfy their vital needs irrespective of the region in which they live.

Analyzing the functioning of the national economy under the conditions of the market economy and elaborating its regulators are the next highly important task. The development of varied forms of ownership and the formation of all-Union markets for goods, securities, and foreign exchange will require more subtle regulation of relations among production entities [subyekt proizvodstva]; the distribution and consumption of output taking account of the demands of ecology and social justice; and active involvement in world economic ties. It will be necessary to compile macroeconomic forecasts for our long-term development with regard to all these parameters. And we must elaborate on this basis proposals to amend the entire range of economic regulators.

Planning the development of our economy's production infrastructure—power generation; the railroads; maritime, air, and pipeline transportation; the defense industry; computers, all-Union communications; and other complexes and systems under the control of union administrative organs—is also an important function of the USSR Gosplan. In order to resolve this task it will be necessary to work with Union and autonomous republics in examining and coordinating the prospects for their development. Both the republics' requirements for the

services of infrastructure sectors and the potential for their development in a specific territory should be clear. Without this neither the republics nor the Soviet Union as a whole will be able to develop.

In order to skillfully resolve all these problems the USSR Gosplan should substantially restructure itself as well (which, incidentally, is a fair comment to make of other departments too). This is the task for the immediate future.

Cities Propose Creation of Free Economic Zones

LD0207131690 Moscow World Service in English
1100 GMT 2 Jul 90

[Text] The city of (Silenograd), near Moscow, is famous for its electronics industry, and it now wants to become a free economic zone. A corresponding document is to be shortly presented to the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation. The idea has been supported by the mayor of Moscow, Gavril Popov, who wants to test a new economic mechanism helping attract foreign investment. Businessmen from South Korea and other countries, and also staff workers of the United States Embassy visited (Silenograd) last week. It is planned to have free economic zones also near Leningrad, in the port city of Nakhodka in the Far East, and other parts of the country.

Aganbegyan Heads Commission on Market Transition

PM0307091790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
1 Jul 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "To Examine Alternate Options"]

[Text] Academician A.G. Aganbegyan, rector of the USSR Council of Ministers National Economic Academy, has been made head of the Commission to Assess Alternate Options for the Transition to a Market Economy. The commission was formed by a 21 June USSR Council of Ministers resolution in accordance with the resolution of the country's Supreme Soviet on the concept of the transition to a regulated market economy.

The government attaches great importance to the elaboration and implementation of the most rational version of this transition incurring the least social and economic cost. That is why the commission has been tasked not only with examining and preparing conclusions on the alternate options, but with elaborating recommendations to include them in the program of related measures to shape, as of this year, the structure and mechanism of a regulated market economy. All the prepared materials should be submitted to the USSR Council of Ministers by 15 August.

The commission includes N.P. Shmelev (deputy chairman), O.T. Bogomolov, A.G. Granberg, V.G. Gribov, A.M. Yemelyanov, T.I. Zaslavskaya, I.D. Ivanov, V.G. Kostakov, V.N. Kudryavtsev, K.V. Kunitskiy, S.I. Lushin, A.L. Makovskiy, V.A. Martynov, B.Z. Milner, A.V. Nikitin, V.D. Protasov, A.I. Tizyakov, V.A.

Tikhonov, G.S. Khizha, V.P. Chichkanov, N.N. Engver, R.M. Entov, and Yu.V. Yaremenko.

The commission is allowed to involve academics and specialists (who will be temporarily relieved of their duties at their main place of work) in order to ensure a high level of scientific work on the alternate options and proposals for the transition to a market economy.

The USSR Council of Ministers calls on the country's scientific public, national economic specialists, and social organizations to actively participate in elaborating a specific program of measures for the transition to a regulated market economy and to submit their proposals on these issues.

Economic Academy Opened to Competitive Entry

PM0207154390 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1400 GMT 28 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast, report by S. Milyanchikov, identified by caption]

[Text] [Announcer] As from this year, enrollment at the USSR Council of Ministers National Economic Academy will be on a competitive basis. I must honestly admit that this report meant nothing to me, as you will appreciate, before I saw our correspondent's report.

[Correspondent] I must warn you straightaway that, unlike the National Economic Institute imeni Plekhanov, about which you hear quite often, no information at all was available about the National Economic Academy until last year.

Established in the mid-seventies to train top economic leaders, it was a closed or, to put it bluntly, an elitist educational establishment. What was taught there? Nothing is known about this. It all happened behind closed doors. But what people actually learned there is obvious from the state of our economy. Give or take a few, one-fourth of its first graduates came to head a number of ministries and departments. And this is not really surprising. Enrollment took place in accordance with a preset quota. Therefore only as many people were sent there as there were places. And the same number graduated.

However, our life is changing. More attention is being paid to the economy. And the academy has begun to change too. First, this year's entrants include directors of joint ventures, associations, companies, and concerns, chairmen of major industrial cooperatives, and people's deputies. And second....

[G.V. Badyeva, prorector in charge of the study program, identified by caption] This year we will be training students in the light of the transition of our country, and specifically our Russia, to a market economy. We have set up new faculties. We have a completely new syllabus based on the needs of a market economy.

[Correspondent] The entrance examinations have ended. And those who have passed them will get down to work in the fall. I believe that we will be able to judge the results within the next few years according to the state of our economy.

Procedure for Buying Goods From Foreigners Given

PM0207144190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
28 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Interview with V. Buslakov, deputy chief of the USSR Trade Ministry Trade Organization Administration, by IZVESTIYA correspondent F. Ivanov; place, date unspecified: "Foreigners in Commission Stores"—first two paragraphs are introduction]

[Text] By agreement with the USSR Finance Ministry, the USSR Trade Ministry has signed an order defining a simplified procedure for buying goods from foreign citizens.

Your IZVESTIYA correspondent asked V. Buslakov, deputy chief of the USSR Trade Ministry Trade Organization Administration, to comment on this innovation.

[Buslakov] Until recently, foreigners coming to the Soviet Union could sell goods they had brought with them through commission stores on the same basis as Soviet citizens. As a rule, however, a period of eight to 10 days elapses between the handover of goods and the receipt of the money. This time is unacceptable for those who come to our country for a short period (and they are in the majority). This is why many foreign tourists have used the services of the "black" market.

The new procedure provides for opening specialized stores or sections where foreigners can receive their money immediately after the goods offered by them to the commission store have been assessed. We hope that this measure will make it possible to sharply increase the influx of goods into the stores and undermine speculative deals. This is not such a new idea, incidentally: Similar stores operated in Moscow about 30 years ago, but for some reason they were gradually phased out.

[Ivanov] At what rates will goods be accepted from foreigners?

[Buslakov] We are gradually phasing out rigid tariffs in the commission trade network. In this case too prices will be by agreement and will be in line with demand. The foreigner selling the goods will receive 85 percent and the remaining 15 percent will go to the store in the form of a commission charge. Under the regulations, goods accepted must be displayed for sale the following day.

[Ivanov] And what kind of things can be bought from foreigners?

[Buslakov] The new procedure envisages accepting non-food goods which are in demand on the Soviet market, are not more than 50 percent worn, and require no repair.

[Ivanov] And how many of these stores are going to be opened?

[Buslakov] We have not established any set figure, but we believe that centers like these will become widespread in the republic capitals, port cities, and historical centers, in short, wherever the majority of foreigners are traditionally received. A number of these centers have already been opened in Moscow under the auspices of commission stores and trade enterprises belonging to the "Vesna" firm.

Staryy Oskol To Produce Construction Items

PM0207143390 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1700 GMT 27 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast; report by Ya. Radzevich, identified by caption]

[Text] [Correspondent, facing camera, against the backdrop of an industrial construction site] Only a year ago this site was a wasteland. And in another year, in 1991, the Oskol Electrometallurgical Combine's production association for construction materials and domestic fittings is to attain its rated capacity. Within a spell of only two years! Is it because it is being built by Italians?

The production association's output is something that everyone is interested in. Wall tiles and bathroom fittings, roof tiles and bricks, sanitary ware, and carpentry goods. And what is more, quality will match world standards.

This has been made possible thanks to the initiative of ferrous metallurgy enterprises and their ministry, which have signed a number of mutually advantageous contracts with foreign firms with the assistance of foreign trade organizations for the production of consumer goods. However, many obstacles had to be overcome, and who knows how many more lie ahead?

[R.Ya. Gugnyak, USSR deputy minister of metallurgy, identified by caption] We are saying: Permit us to market what we produce over and above the state order. We want to use this output to buy equipment for the production of consumer goods for the population. What we are asking is not to buy equipment for the metallurgical industry. No one can accuse us of any kind of departmentalism. We are asking to be able to buy equipment for the production of goods which will benefit the entire population.

[Correspondent] Having arrived at the Oskol combine, we were able to see for ourselves that the metalworkers' intentions are most serious. Construction here, which incidentally began 16 June of last year, is being conducted under contract by the Italian CO.GE.IM. Company.

[V.V. Anokhin, deputy director of the Oskol Electrometallurgical Combine, identified by caption] Six months ago we signed a turnkey contract, and now we already have all the production premises. That is, we are installing equipment in the first production unit and we are hoping to start up production of ceramic bricks as early as August.

I believe that here we are setting a precedent and an example of how acute problems can be resolved. I am referring to the housing problem, the processing industry, and agricultural production. In my opinion buying existing technologies and putting them to use within the shortest possible time is the only way to tackle this.

[Correspondent] Staryy Oskol is not the only place where production of consumer goods is to be started up in the near future. The foundations have already been laid for a domestic refrigerator plant at the Novolipetsk combine, and contracts for the production of furniture, car batteries, and other goods have been signed.

It must be mentioned, however, that the Ministry of Finance and the Vneshekonombank [Bank for Foreign Economic Activity] are not overenthusiastic as regards these activities of the Ministry of Ferrous Metallurgy. Incidentally, we are hoping to return to this subject.

Agricultural

Farm Chairman Comments on Increased Grain Prices

PM2906125190 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1700 GMT 27 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast; report by P. Guskov and R. Ushanov, identified by caption]

[Text] [Announcer] Mass grain harvesting has begun in the southeast of Stavropol Kray. Grain growers are planning to harvest some 5 million tonnes of grain, which, in view of the increased procurement prices, should produce tangible profits. However, Stavropol Kray grain growers are not banking on this. Why? You can find out from our report.

[Correspondent] The first combines have arrived in the fields of the "Sovetskiy" kolkhoz [collective farm] in Stavropol Kray's Kirovskiy Rayon. The inevitable worries on the eve of the harvest—bad weather, spare parts shortages, shortcomings in the supply of gasoline—are a thing of the past. More than 10,000 combines, including more than 2,000 of the most modern "Don-1500" combines, are taking part in this year's harvest, during which Stavropol grain growers are again planning to harvest some 5 million tonnes of grain.

This year's grain should produce a sizable profit for the kolkhoz. After all, grain prices have been increased substantially.

[S.A. Shiryayev, chairman of "Sovetskiy" kolhoz, identified by caption] Even before the introduction of the new prices we have been saddled with new insurance payments which are running approximately R500,000 above our estimates, which have thus been proved wrong. The new prices have been introduced—and this is not the first time that this has been done—not to promote the development of agriculture, of our economy, but as an adjustment to the price hikes which occurred earlier. I am referring to higher prices for machinery, fertilizers, and construction materials. Furthermore, a new taxation system is about to be introduced. You will understand why we are not too overjoyed over the new prices. They may raise our profits, but if there is a tax on profits, the higher our profits, the higher the tax will be. This, in a nutshell, is our attitude to the new prices.

[Newscaster] Apart from this, the harvested grain will be delivered to elevators where people are not interested in exceeding the state order either. The RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Ministry of Grain Products allocates limited funds for the payment of wages of elevator service personnel. This negative material incentives practice may prove a painful blow to this year's harvest.

Metal Shortage Halts Combine Harvester Output

PM0307095990 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1400 GMT 30 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast; reportage by Yu. Sysoyev, S. Novoselov, identified by caption]

[Text] [Announcer] Here is a report by our Krasnoyarsk correspondent. It is devoted to the fact that production lines for the assembly of "Yenisey" combine harvesters are at a standstill for the second week in succession.

[Correspondent] According to economists, lack of balance between a state order and material backup always leads to disruptions in the production process.

At the Krasnoyarsk combine harvester plant this problem has now acquired particular urgency.

[Unidentified worker] Harvest time is upon us and we can't get components for our machines. The demand for our machines is great. And we can't meet the orders which are arriving at the plant. People want to work, but there is no work.

[Second unidentified worker] I have worked at this plant for 39 years and I have never seen such a mess during the whole of my career. This is a result of the irresponsible attitude of our Gosplan [State Planning Committee] and of the ministry which are incapable of supplying us with metal.

[Unidentified speaker] We are such a great country, are we really to believe that there is no metal?

[A.G. Nikitin, chief engineer, identified by caption] Repeated appeals during the whole of this year to various organs, including a deputy's question from Comrade Veprev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Agrarian Questions and Food, to Comrade Mostovoy [chairman of the USSR Gosnab (State Committee for Material and Technical Supply)] proved of no avail.

And what is even worse, the Gosnab continues to pretend that all is well. The reply to Veprev's question was signed by Pashchenko, Mostovoy's deputy, who alleged that the requirement of the Krasnoyarsk combine harvester production association has been met 106 percent. This does not correspond to reality.

[Correspondent] And this reality is sad. The machine builders will probably have to find their own suppliers. However, until now they did not have a right to do this. They must be given this right.

New Prices for Grain Mean Higher Incomes

LD0207120190 Moscow World Service in English
0700 GMT 2 Jul 90

[Text] The new government purchasing prices of grain will make it possible for Soviet farmers to have much bigger incomes. Experts say that the collective and government farms this season will be able to get an additional income of R9 billion. This has been disclosed by Bolyus Pozhkus, one of the high-ranking officials of the government Committee for Food and Purchases. He also said that there could be bigger payments in hard currency for especially valuable varieties of wheat. A good harvest is said to have been grown in the south of the country.

Scientific

'Mir' Cosmonauts Prepare for 'Intense' Day

LD0307034590 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
0200 GMT 3 Jul 90

[Text] The crew of the Mir orbital complex have an intense working day today.

From 0900 until 1500 Anatoliy Solovyev and Aleksandr Balandin will engage in scientific experiments.

After a rest, from about 1800 the cosmonauts will begin ("demothballing") the Soyuz-TM9 transport ship, which will then be transferred from the Kvant module to the [word indistinct] ("detachment point") of the transfer compartment of the base unit. The redocking will take place on the night of 3-4 July.

The rearrangement of the modules of the orbital complex is being carried out in accordance with the forthcoming work of the crew in open space, intended for 17 July.

Causes of White Sea Poisoning Remain Obscure

PM0307095590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
26 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Report by correspondent Viktor Fridman: "Mystery Remains Unsolved"]

[Text] Arkhangelsk—The ecological situation remains complex following the tragedy in the White Sea. A government commission of scientists and experts has spent three days studying the situation on the spot. So what happened?

After checking all the materials placed at our disposal, we cannot say for certain that it was all due to the effect of radiation on the flora and fauna of the White Sea, said B. Tenyakov, deputy chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] State Committee for Environmental Protection. The analyses did not confirm either that components of the rocket fuel dropped by the military in an emergency last December were involved. The theory that it was due to canisters containing mustard gas, allegedly dropped in the water in the fifties, was also rejected. The government commission reached the conclusion that the starfish had been killed by toxic agents. What toxic agents? In what volume? There was no answer to these questions. The main thing now is to establish the cause of the death of the starfish. Samples will be taken of the water, the soil, and the fauna; the investigation program is being expanded; and the country's leading scientists are being brought in. They have the requisite equipment at their disposal, in particular a special trawl net that enables them to take samples of soil, vegetation, and fish at great depths. Marine fauna will be carefully studied....

So the cause of the ecological disaster has not yet been established. Will it ever be established? The commission has gone to Moscow. The shore where the disaster occurred is empty: The dead starfish have been gathered up and buried. There is another theory however—we quote from a letter to the Arkhangelsk Oblast Soviet Executive Committee by war veteran Z. Ivanova: "Perhaps the mysterious disaster in the White Sea is the first news of a disaster caused by extraterrestrials, who are paying more and more frequent visits to Earth? A kind of retribution for the way people, including scientists, have neglected nature...."

What can one say about extraterrestrials and extraterrestrial interference? As for neglect, that is absolutely true. The question is how long will it go on and lead to further tragedies?

Fears Over Mukachevo Radar Station Rebutted

PM0207145190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 29 Jun 90 First Edition p 1

[“Viewpoint” article by Candidate of Medical Sciences K. Nikonova, senior scientific staffer of the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences Scientific Research Institute of Labor Hygiene and Occupational Diseases;

Doctor of Medical Sciences Prof. V. Shekhadyrov, deputy scientific director of the USSR Health Ministry's Biophysics Institute; Candidate of Medical Sciences V. Stepanov, head of the Hygienic Norm-Setting Laboratory of the USSR Health Ministry's Biophysics Institute; and Candidate of Mathematicophysical Sciences V. Yemelyanov, head of the Biophysics Laboratory of the USSR Health Ministry's Biophysics Institute; first paragraph is KRASNAYA ZVEZDA introduction: "Radar Station in Transcarpathia: Emotions and Facts"]

[Text] The question of the construction of a radar station in the region of Mukachevo has recently been debated in a number of mass information organs. Unfortunately, this problem is frequently examined one-sidedly and emotions prevail over a sober assessment of the facts. We offer for readers' attention the opinion of competent specialists on this question.

Certain public statements by a number of scientists of Uzhgorod University as well as articles in the press (IZVESTIYA 12 May 1990) devoted to the radar station under construction in the Mukachevo region make what is, in our view, a not quite correct assessment of the possible effect of radio emissions on the population. It is emphasized, in particular, that the rated flux density of the radar station's radiating power close to population centers exceeds the normatives.

Despite feeling the utmost respect for the opinion of Transcarpathian Oblast scientists, we believe that the question of the permissibility of particular levels of radar station radio emissions on adjacent territories can and must be decided only by specialists with the appropriate competence from the USSR and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic Ministries of Health who bear full responsibility for the decisions adopted.

The desire to avoid a future repetition of situations, analogous to that which has taken shape in Transcarpathia, requires broad circles of the population to be informed that the present "radiophobia" is not substantiated by the actual state of affairs. The USSR Council of Ministers State Commission under the leadership of Academician Ye.P. Velikhov, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, in whose work we participated, established that the actual rated power of the station's electromagnetic flux will not exceed the normatives laid down in the "Provisional Sanitary Norms and Regulations for the Population's Protection Against the Effect of the Electromagnetic Flux Created by Radio-technical Installations."

Levels of the effect of electromagnetic radiation, for working specialists and the population, which fully ensure people's safety have now been laid down in the USSR. At the same time the hygienic normatives that apply in the USSR are substantially lower than the national standards of other countries and the international recommendations of the Committee for Protection Against Nonionizing Radiation. Thus the density of the radiation energy flux created by a radar station of the

Mukachevo type on the territory of populated places must not exceed 10 microwatts per square centimeter. This value stands at 1,000 microwatts per square centimeter in the United States, 2,500 in the FRG, 400 in Britain, and 200 in Canada. The level of 200 microwatts per square centimeter is also defined in international recommendations. Thus, the levels of radiation energy flux density in the USSR are 100 times less than in the United States and 20 times less than those recommended by the International Committee for Protection Against Nonionizing Radiation and do not cause biological effects which result in a person's health being impaired.

Under international treaties, space tracking stations are based on the territory of various countries. And in not one country today do they arouse such negative responses as is the case in Transcarpathia. There can be just one explanation for the situation that has taken shape: the growth of democratization and of public activeness when the population is inadequately informed. An unhealthy atmosphere was being fueled in the district for many months. Absurd rumors were being spread about the siting of a unit of the Chernobyl Nuclear Electric Power Station on the radar station's territory, about the possibility of the mushroom (?) contamination of the population with radiation, etc.

We would like to urge the population to make a sober assessment of the current events. We live in times when we must in each specific case assess the positive and negative aspects of particular deeds of man. As regards the radar station in Transcarpathia, as we have shown it poses no danger to the population's health. And it seems to us that no one disputes the installation's importance for the country.

Chief of Soviet Cable TV Interviewed

PM0207122990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
25 June 90 Second Edition p 1

[Interview with Vitaliy Rozhko, general director of the production and creative association "Cable Television," by T. Danilova; first two paragraphs are Danilova introduction; place and date of interview not specified: "New Boom for Cable TV?"]

[Text] Is it possible that we are beginning to experience another boom like the one that occurred during the appearance of the first television sets, when the happy owners of the tiny blue screens invited relatives, neighbors, and acquaintances every evening to their homes? Today people go visiting in order to see a cable TV program.

We asked Vitaliy Rozhko, the general director of the production and creative association "Cable Television," which was founded in May of this year, to tell readers of this paper about this broadcasting novelty's prospects for development.

[Danilova] The development of cable television in our country is gathering pace. About 500 networks are

already operating at the present time, covering 1.5 million subscribers in more than 200 cities.

[Rozhko] Cable television is a new level of thinking and even a new branch of civilization. It is a mighty factor in election campaigns and, with the phone-in channels, for every conceivable sort of up to the minute opinion poll. Incidentally, the expenses on the average sized network are recouped in roughly one and a half years. However, everyone who has decided to devote himself to this important innovation today has a mass of problems. There is insufficient equipment—there is only one enterprise, in Grodno, which produces it, and there is even a shortage of cable as well; and the technical imperfection of the equipment is the cause of frequent defects. Output shortages are not the least of the difficulties. The studios run exactly the same "remaindered" foreign films, and this quickly bores the consumers. As for the production of their own programs, things are in a pathetic state. This is why the USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting has decided to help cable television to find its feet.

[Danilova] Would not many people interpret this seemingly noble action by the State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting as an attempt to establish control over glasnost...?

[Rozhko] This is not the first time that I have heard such fears expressed. They were heard at the first all-union conference on cable television which took place at the beginning of the year. There were 225 representatives of different studios, and we managed to reach a consensus. A draft statute was drawn up for a future cable television union, at the basis of which is stipulated the equality of all its members. If there are 100 constituent members, then the State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting will be one out of 100! From 30 July through 5 August we plan to hold a constituent congress in Moscow with a view to consolidating our forces and resources, and working out specific plans. Including the juridical and legal aspects of activity.

[Danilova] And what functions does the State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting intend to assume?

[Rozhko] State television has been invested with juridical powers, and through the "Sovtelexport" association it can enter into talks with foreign television companies and ensure efficient and regular program reception via the communications satellite network.

Military

Yeltsin Interviewed on Army Reform

OW0307102490 Moscow Television Service in Russian
2130 GMT 30 Jun 90

[Interview with Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the RSFSR, by V. Ionov on Red Square; date unknown; from the "Serving the Fatherland" program—recorded]

[Text] [video shows cadets marching across Red Square] Moscow, Red Square. It has become a good tradition to give cadets of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet Moscow Higher Combined Arms Command School their start in life on the country's main square. This graduating class is the 113th in the history of the nation's oldest military institute. The festive graduation ceremony for young officers was attended by USSR Minister of Defense and Marshal of the Soviet Union Dmitriy Timofeyevich Yazov, Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the RSFSR Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, and prominent military commanders. After the official ceremony, the chairman of the Russian parliament was interviewed by our program.

[Ionov] Tell us, please, what sort of hopes are pinned on the officer corps today?

[Yeltsin] I think that reform lies ahead in the Army. I have already spoken with the minister of defense and he agrees with this to the extent that very serious changes should occur in the Army in all respects—in the system for training personnel and in its structure and the mission of the Army. Of course we need to free it from tasks it is not designed to do. The level of training must of course be improved, that is, its skills....[changes thought] Well, with fewer numbers. That is the task—with fewer numbers, nevertheless to keep the country's defense in reliable hands.

[Ionov] You know, there is now much talk in the press, that is in the mass media, of creating a professional army. There are fervent opponents of this and there are supporters of this. However, if one lays aside emotions and views this issue from both a political and an economic perspective....[changes thought] Well, what is your view on this?

[Yeltsin] I am sure we will come to this. I am convinced of it. At some stage there should be, well, precisely during this reform of the Army there should be a step-by-step resolution of this problem. However, that is what we will come to. There needs to be preparation, a psychological (?adjustment) in society and in the Army itself, and there are of course economic tasks. Then we need a new training system. After all, it does not mean that any young person can simply join the professional army and become a defender of the motherland. Some kind of very extensive network of schools is needed, or even possibly several months of training at the level of a home guard so that at any moment he can, if he wishes, become a professional serviceman.

This will undoubtedly greatly raise the qualitative content of the Armed Forces. I think this will be of benefit and the guarantees and social protection will be better. It turns out that at present the man in an officer's uniform is not socially protected.

[Ionov] Yes, and we receive a great number of letters from officers. They have nowhere to live.

[Yeltsin] Absolutely right.

[Ionov] They are people without any comforts, but they carry enormous responsibility on their shoulders. It turns out that they receive nothing.

[Yeltsin] In other words, what happens is that they are prepared to defend their homeland, their motherland, whereas we—the Soviet authorities, if you will—generally have no levers of any kind to offer everyone social protection, particularly today when a reduction in the Armed Forces is taking place. Now this involves thousands and thousands, tens and hundreds of thousands, which if multiplied by family members amounts to a million people. Of course today these families find themselves in the gravest of situations. We possibly need a special law on social protection, particularly for those who are today becoming subject to reductions in Armed Forces, as well as all of those who are in the Army, all the officers who live in very, very poor living conditions and have no housing. This undoubtedly has its effect on both the morale and, of course, on discipline in the Army. I think that as far as this is concerned there must be some kind of legislative act, because even the local soviets are not fulfilling their responsibility to provide what they are supposed to provide for the Army. The armed forces⁴ in the oblasts, the autonomous oblasts, and other areas constantly receive significantly less housing than they are supposed to. [passage indistinct]

[Ionov] Boris Nikolayevich, the Armed Forces' spring call-up campaign bordered on failure. Now they are holding the autumn call-up. Can the same thing happen? That is, how can we get out of, how can we resolve this complex problem?

[Yeltsin] I understand. You know, there are several reasons for this. One of the reasons is that there are people with religious convictions and some others who cannot serve, and they are forcibly conscripted. That is an (?unacceptable) situation. They simply refuse to serve and that is that. We end up with a constant shortfall, so to speak. Therefore, we need to find some form of alternative service, that is something where you do not go directly into the Army, something related to other kinds of service. They would report for this alternative service.

[Ionov] Boris Nikolayevich, in various regions of our country there now exist so-called nationalist armed groups which believe and which claim that only they and their army will defend this or that republic. They do not recognize the Soviet Army.

[Yeltsin] You know, in the People's Deputies of Russia Congress there were also many proposals that the sovereignty which we declared in the declaration on the Russian Federation's state sovereignty, that this sovereignty needs to be defended, to be defended by the Russian Federation's own army. However, if we separate our Armed Forces by nationality, that will mean we will not have an Army as we know it. It would be—I do not know what you would call it—little unattached islands. It

would not be a united Army which could at any moment strongly defend our country. Therefore, I am against dividing things up by nationality and the creation of some sort of national armies, although our proposal....[changes thought] Yesterday we adopted a special resolution delineating the functions between Russian services, government departments, and others, and those of the union. We determined that the Ministry of Defense, the KGB, communications, air transport, rail transport, and the merchant marine belong in the all-Union sphere. All the rest is under the jurisdiction of Russia, but....[changes thought] and we believe there should be a minister of defense of Russia, but without a ministry. That is, there should be a minister of defense with, let us say, 20 advisors specifically for coordinating with the Union Ministry of Defense on resolving issues involving troops and units located within the Russian Federation.

[Ionov] Do you already have a candidate?

[Yeltsin] Well, I am not going to give a name right now, because the Supreme Soviet will decide that. I think it should be a civilian.

[Ionov] As in the United States, for example?

[Yeltsin] Yes. However his advisors will be specialists, professionals, generals, and others. Then we will have the kind of cooperation where we will have a feel for the Army's presence on Russia's territory. That concerns the social protection I already mentioned and the movement of troops, construction, the organization of the Army's units and subunits, and transfers to other regions. We should not be on the sidelines of this issue. We should decide this issue along with the Ministry of Defense of the Union, if some subunit is sent to another republic. We should know about that. Why is it being transferred? If it is for something the Army is not designed for, for use against a peaceful population, we should try to stop that.

[Ionov] The last question, Boris Nikolayevich. How do you interpret the phrase: to serve the Fatherland?

[Yeltsin] Well, I think that means to serve the people, because we do not of course have true people power [narodovlastiye]. Therefore, we in the People's Deputies Congress passed a special resolution on people power, on how to bring about real people power. This means, as far as the military is concerned, serving in the name of the people, serving the people, and fulfilling their will. [video cuts to show Yeltsin mingling with military officers, departing in limousine]

Lizichev Interviewed on Party Role in Army

PM0307110090 Paris LIBERATION in French
30 Jun-1 Jul 90 p 14

[Interview with General Aleksey Lizichev, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, by Pierre Briancon in Moscow]

[Text] Moscow—[Briancon] The country has theoretically moved over to a multiparty system. How does that change your role?

[Lizichev] The Army's political directorate fulfills two kinds of function. First, functions which are normally state functions, everything connected with the moral, political, military, and legal training of soldiers. Second, more directly political functions related to the party—the political directorate supervises the activity of the million party members in the Army, it acts as a Central Committee directorate.

[Briancon] If the multiparty system became a fact, could you be the last person to hold such a position?

[Lizichev] We must be prepared for that. At a time when the party is abandoning its role of direct management in the administration and the economy, we must establish a twofold structure. On the one hand, the political leadership of the Army will deal with everything which relates to the state which the party will no longer deal with: training, public relations, the media, and interaction with all the social and political organizations. On the other hand, there will be the party organizations at all levels which will depend directly on the Central Committee.

[Briancon] Some Supreme Soviet military deputies are asking for the Army to be purely and simply depoliticized.

[Lizichev] I do not believe in complete "depoliticization." As in every country in the world, the Army depends on the government of the day. And the party which is in power implements its military policy thanks to the Army. What could be called the "departyization" of the Army is a different matter. This question has been raised.

[Briancon] Can political groups other than the Communist Party now become established in the Army?

[Lizichev] So far none has expressed the desire to create such structures. But there is no legal ban on that. However, the realization of a multiparty system in the Army would not help its combat capability. I do not think that all political organizations could be allowed to be established in the Army. This leaves two possibilities: Either the party which is in power, and which therefore has the people's confidence, has the right to establish itself in the Army. Or no political group must have permanent structures in the Army.

[Briancon] It seems that we are now witnessing a crisis in relations between the Army and the nation....

[Lizichev] Like any part of society, the Army reflects the processes taking place in the country. There is no war at present, and some of the Soviets are beginning to have doubts about the need for powerful, combat-ready armed forces. But this is not what determines relations between the Army and society. The Soviet people respect the work of the military.

[Briancon] General Moiseyev, chief of staff, has criticized the draft party "platform" for the congress, because it neglects military problems....

[Lizichev] A draft is intended to be criticized. All the party organizations in the Army approved the draft platform for the 28th congress, but with criticisms and thousands of proposals. Having said that, a platform is not a program, but we want there to be a resolution on military questions at the congress.

[Briancon] Do you have the impression that the military are now less well represented in the highest levels of power?

[Lizichev] No. We have 83 deputies representing the military in the new Supreme Soviet, deputies of all ranks from lieutenant to army general. In the old Supreme Soviet we had only 55 representatives.

[Briancon] But this representation is no longer homogeneous, the captains often no longer have the same viewpoints as the generals.

[Lizichev] This question is greatly emphasized as if people were deliberately trying to set officers against generals. There are real and inevitable conflicts. A captain regards me as an army general, his superior. But, in the Supreme Soviet, everybody is on the same level.

[Briancon] How has the Red Army viewed events in East Europe?

[Lizichev] These events are a direct result of perestroika and of the new political thinking. Each country can live as it wishes. Our soldiers know this policy. They have reacted without surprise or anxiety.

[Briancon] What would happen in the Army if the Soviets wanted to abandon the "socialist choice" as the East European peoples have done?

[Lizichev] I can answer very clearly: The Army is part of society. It will therefore never turn against the people. In the other East European countries, we are not acting on the basis of what we want but of what exists. The Warsaw Pact as a military organization is on the decline. Our officers have understood and accepted that.

[Briancon] When the Berlin Wall fell, people thought in terms of German reunification in several years, not in several months....

[Lizichev] Of course, we could not have thought that things would move so quickly.

[Briancon] And this unexpected speed must surely present military problems?

[Lizichev] Undoubtedly. But when perestroika first started in the country, we could not predict everything that would happen in our country either. We must now

carefully study the problems connected with our security, which we want to be based on a reasonable sufficiency and on balance. This is how our determination to prevent Germany being part of NATO must be understood.

[Briancon] Is that why you have slowed down the withdrawal of Soviet troops from the GDR?

[Lizichev] It is one reason, and for this transitional period. We have withdrawn troops from Czechoslovakia and Hungary. Moving too rapidly is not a good thing.

[Briancon] Why would a united Germany be less dangerous for the USSR if it was anchored in the Western bloc than if it was left to itself like a free radical? [sentence as published]

[Lizichev] We are soldiers. And our country suffered great losses during the war. We are seeking a solution which would not give an advantage to either of the two blocs.

[Briancon] Is there not some incompatibility between perestroika—a world of disorder—and the Army—a world of order?

[Lizichev] I do not share your viewpoint. Perestroika is primarily a task of building. But this is a complex period, there is glasnost, democratization, and freedom of speech on the one hand. On the other there is the rise in crime, the fall in discipline, the euphoria caused by meetings, the nationalities question, not to mention economic problems. These changes are taking place in a very contradictory way. But that is bound to be the case. As everybody knows, the road to heaven is a thorny one.

General Ivashov Comments on Conscription Changes

*LD0207225490 Moscow Television Service in Russian
2018 GMT 2 Jul 90*

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] A report from our new agency POSTFAKTUM says that a draft transformation is now being prepared according to which call-ups to the Armed Forces would be reduced to one per year, and the period of service in the Army to one year. Today we asked Major-General L.G. Ivashov, head of the Affairs Directorate of the USSR Ministry of Defense, to explain.

[Begin Ivashov recording] Well, there is simply no possibility at present of cutting the period of active military service, fixed-term military service, to one year. There are no such opportunities in connection with both the reduction in call-up resources and with other conditions.

It is intended that, from next year onwards, servicemen in the Navy will serve in the same way as other categories—for two years instead of the three years they presently serve. That's the first stage, as it were. The

introduction of an 18-month period of service is in the rather distant future. I think that that will be realistic after 1995. [end recording]

Panel Discusses Reform, Problems in Military

90UM0699A Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian
27 Jun 90 p 4

["Abridged report" of discussion "What Kind of Army Do We Need?" with people's deputies and military officials, chaired by Captain Third Rank V. Urban, at KRASNAYA ZVEZDA festival in Moscow on 10 June: "The Army and Military Reform"]

[Text] KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Day, Response

On 10 June a discussion was held at the festival of our newspaper at the Gorkiy Central Park of Culture and Recreation, the topic of which was "What Kind of Army Do We Need?"

The following spoke to KRASNAYA ZVEZDA readers and responded to their numerous questions: Hero of the Soviet Union Colonel Valeriy Ochirov, USSR people's deputy and deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Issues of Defense and State Security; Colonel Viktor Alksnis, USSR people's deputy and deputy of the Supreme Soviet of Latvia; Colonel Nikolay Petrushenko, USSR people's deputy and cochairman of the "Soyuz" Deputy Group; Hero of the Soviet Union Colonel Aleksandr Rutskey, RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic] people's deputy and deputy chairman of the deputy group of representatives of the Armed Forces, the KGB, and reserve officers; Lieutenant Colonel Sergey Yushenkov, RSFSR people's deputy and candidate of philosophical sciences; Major Vladimir Lopatin, USSR people's deputy and chairman of the temporary working commission of a subcommittee on military reform of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Issues of Defense and State Security.

We publish an abridged report on the discussion with the participation of the people's deputies.

[Lopatin] What kind of Army do we need? What determines prerequisites for military reform? Is it needed at present?

We no longer have to persuade anyone that reform is necessary. The leadership of the country and the government acknowledged this. However, our military leaders were compelled to acknowledge reality only after that. At present, there is evolution even in their views. In particular the recent article in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA by the minister of defense entitled "The Military Reform" testifies to this.

In recent months a lot has been written about perestroika in the Army. A tangle of problems has developed there which needs to be untied. An information breakthrough of sorts has been accomplished. We know what kind of problems these are, and they cannot be passed over in silence anymore. The main conditions which

necessitate the reform, the main conditions for preparing and carrying out the reform, as well as the forces counteracting these processes, are associated with these problems.

First of all it is the militarization of the economy and the dictate of the military-industrial complex (VPK). This is exactly where the main condition for the military reform is found. How much does our country spend on defense? For a long time it was said: 20 billion rubles [R]. Now, it is R70 billions. Recently other numbers have been mentioned in the press: 150, 200, 300 billion.... Who can say what the upper limit is?

Even the leadership of the country will not come up with a specific answer, and not because it does not want to but because it does not know the answer. Indeed the leadership does not know. At present all the funds of the military budget are distributed among 10 ministries. A substantial segment of the funds spent by republics and enterprises is not registered or defrayed by anyone.

Where is the way out? The way out is to unify the entire military budget under one entity, for the budget to have one master—the Ministry of Defense. This is one of the main conditions for implementing the military reform. Meanwhile, the military-industrial complex compels the delivery of materiel which, as they say, on many occasions the military-industrial complex alone needs rather than the Armed Forces. I will note that there is materiel whose quality is quite poor.

It has been proposed for many years now that the Ministry of Defense be made the only holder of military shares, but everything remains the way it used to be. What is the situation? He who pays the piper orders the music. This is a proverb. Actually, it is the same in reality: He who has more funds in the military-industrial complex and greater powers dictates the development of "his" materiel. At times, the amounts of it produced at present are not even needed.

What can this be countered with? Only with legislative control. So far it does not exist. The Supreme Soviet Committee for Issues of Defense and State Security is still incapable of controlling the situation confidently. There are very many military-industrial complex representatives on it.

The second condition necessitating the military reform is political. This is also one of the main principles of the reform. However, it is virtually not being implemented.

Through constitutional procedures the CPSU has given up its monopoly on power in favor of the state organs. The Army should be subordinated to these organs. However, in our opinion these organs still remain an instrument of the party. Certain political circles are holding on to this instrument, this force, in every way possible; they may try to use it in the struggle for power in the environment of the emerging multiparty system.

Once the law on public associations is adopted, all parties will become legally established and will demand that their organizations be created in the Armed Forces. This will cause the Army to turn from an element of stability into the subject of a power struggle.

We see a way out in discontinuing the operation of political parties within the framework of the structures which ensure the stability of our society and state security, such as the Army, the KGB, the militia, the procuracy, and so on. However the article "The Military Reform" does not provide for this.

Finally, the last condition. The prestige of military service is declining. This is a reality. This is one more argument in favor of the need to prepare military reform and develop its program and adopt the laws which the Ministry of Defense is now developing after that. As of now there are only four laws which regulate service in the military: On Comprehensive Military Service Duty, Chapter 5 of the USSR Constitution, On Penalties for Military Crimes, and On Retirement Benefits for Servicemen. This is all. The rest is expressed by the formula: "A commander's order is the law for his subordinates."

We see a way out in switching gradually to the voluntary basis of recruitment by virtue of professional Army contracts. This way of building the Armed Forces is used in 58 countries of the world. In the course of this the Ministry of Defense should become an administrative management organ headed by civilians. It is necessary to separate from it the functions of the General Staff.

Some of the provisions developed by our commission are reflected in the article by the minister of defense "The Military Reform." However, there is still no movement on the elements which I have just discussed (although they constitute the core of the military reform). This means that for now there is no reform proper. At present our draft concept is in the commissions and committees of the Supreme Soviet, in the Presidential Council.... However, we should enlist for this work as many people and public organizations as possible. This is a guarantee against possible mistakes. This is why our draft concept of military reform needs to be published in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, as well as the draft which will be worked out by the commission of the Ministry of Defense, and a discussion should subsequently begin.

Selected Answers to Questions

[Question] What is your attitude toward the creation of the RSFSR Armed Forces?

[Lopatin] Our draft concept provides for the creation of a smaller professional army for defending the interests of the state. The heart of the matter is what our state will amount to, and how the issue of national-state structure is going to be resolved. This is the most significant problem, and only later may we respond to the question about the Army. If there is going to be a confederation

then, probably, every republic will have considerably more extensive rights, including the right to its own army.

[Question] Explain what you have been expelled from the CPSU for.

[Lopatin] Let me note: I was in the process of being expelled. There have been publications in the press concerning this. I do not agree with the wording of my reinstatement in the party. I do not agree with the reprimand and the responsibility of officials who were the organizers of this affair, and not only on my own account. I consider my case to be particular. There are and will be many such cases unless those who violate the law are held accountable. Lawlessness will continue for as long as one's right to power is superior to the requirements of the law.

[Ochirov] Perhaps we should discuss the work of our committee. The Supreme Soviet Committee for Issues of Defense and State Security has been operative for less than a year. However, you have the right to expect more. We are not satisfied ourselves either, though there are objective reasons for this. Our legislative activities should be based on fundamental legal acts. However, only the first steps have been taken in this direction.

As you know, the Law on Retirement Benefits for Servicemen has been adopted. A draft law on defense, our main document, is being prepared. A draft law on the KGB is being worked out. Draft regulations on military service procedures and the Law on the Status of Servicemen are coming up. All these documents are likely to be considered and adopted as soon as the next parliamentary session in the fall.

There are very many problems. As I have already said, the absence of basic laws is the main obstacle. Let us also add to this the lack of experience on the part of parliament members, especially in matters of defense. I am not going to conceal this.

We have already discussed our military budget here. There is only a one-time experience of its discussion, at the second session. However, work will proceed more thoroughly, line by line, when we adopt the budget for the coming year. We will begin publishing the data just as the United States releases its military expenditures. Only in this manner may various rumors and fabrications be refuted. The main point is for our people themselves to understand what a pretty penny our defense costs us. This will be clear when we give the entire budget to the Ministry of Defense—such is the conclusion of the committee. At present both the defense-industry plants and military-construction detachments of civilian departments are covered by military expenditures.... We need to sort this out. We intend to publish all statistics really associated with defense.

As far as the concept of the military reform is concerned Deputy Lopatin, chairman of the commission, has discussed it in quite some detail. I believe that we have accomplished our task at the first stage because we have compelled both the president and the minister of defense to talk about it. We need the reform, and it needs to be adopted.

[Question] Has anybody specifically calculated expenditures for switching to a professional army?

[Ochirov] There is a military department at the Moscow Institute of Finance. A conference on military economic issues was held there. Over there we were told: They tell you over and over again that switching to a professional army is expensive and is beyond the resources of the country, but they do not provide arguments. The specialists of the department are prepared to make such calculations but nobody has commissioned them. They have worked on several preliminary versions on their own and presented their calculations at this conference. Particularly noteworthy is the variant of mixed recruitment to the Armed Forces as in, for example, West Germany. Therefore there is something to proceed from.

[Question] When will transition to a professional army begin?

[Ochirov] The draft concept of military reform calls for a switch to contract service in the main military occupations. There are such opportunities in the Air Force, Navy, and Strategic Missile Troops. As I see it, this process will proceed painlessly.

[Question] Why don't the military deputies demand that a law on the defense of the honor and dignity of servicemen be adopted?

[Ochirov] Indeed, servicemen are the least socially protected stratum of society. Any civilian may be fired from his job. However, he can appeal this decision and take the matter to court. If the management is not right the person fired will also have his costs defrayed. There is no such thing in the Army. They may even dismiss you illegally, but it is virtually impossible to come back. The resolution of such situations will be provided for in the laws on defense and the status of servicemen and in military service regulations.

[Petrushenko] I will repeat the question: "What kind of Army do we need at present?" I believe that all of us agree that a strong and authoritative Army is needed. However, I would also ask another question: What kind of reforms does the Army need? I am also a proponent of reforms, but I do not like haste in any endeavor. Even if I were given a guarantee that all the reforms we have implemented—economic reform, school reform, land reform, and so on—were crowned with success, I would still think twice. Meanwhile, in reality, not a single reform has been completed.

We still do not know precisely where our society is headed judging by the results of the first five years of

perestroika. At this point I would like to recall that the Supreme Soviet has already made a hasty decision. It dismissed students from the service. Out of more than 150,000 former soldiers, 13,000 did not come back to colleges. Think of it. Almost one soldier in 10.

Furthermore, all of us remember the tragic events in Baku. You remember (this was shown on TV) how the funeral of the victims was held, and how flowers were placed on their graves. However, nobody from the Supreme Soviet laid flowers on the graves of the 49 soldiers killed. In part, they died because there were no experienced sergeants next to some of these boys. Let us also add to this 180 wounded.

So the concept of military reform that Deputy Lopatin referred to. Does it hold water? Have the tragic events in Transcaucasia and Central Asia not taught us that national armies cannot be created? But the draft of the reform provides for this. Thus, the situation itself convinces us that the internationalist principle of recruitment to the Armed Forces needs to be maintained.

Now about future professional soldiers. Who will enlist? This is not mentioned. At present we have thousands of vacancies for warrant officers. People do not enlist.... It is quite possible that some people will only stand to win if the service of contract soldiers is introduced. Let us look at me. Since esteemed Vladimir Nikolayevich Lopatin proposes to give a sergeant my pay next year, a colonel will rake in still more. Besides, I will be rid of taking care of your sons every day. It is easier to manage them by the ruble method.

Let us assume that such ideal conditions are created. However, the time will then come to seriously change work with mobilization resources; they will have to be created simultaneously. The Americans have already come to this conclusion.

We cannot agree with the idea of depoliticizing the Army either. It is premature to consider it. Had this proposal by Comrade Lopatin been adopted at the Third Congress of USSR People's Deputies, the fate of not only the party to which I have devoted 20 years but also of party assets would be solved without my participation, because I am sure that a split in the CPSU is unavoidable. We would have also been deprived of the right to elect delegates to the 28th congress.

[Question] You are well aware of the situation involving the Semipalatinsk Testing Ground. Perhaps you know that the military department ran experiments with individuals of the Kazakh nationality.... What is your attitude toward this?

[Petrushenko] I know how this question came up. In the Kazakhstan press articles were published on how a hydrogen explosion occurred on 12 August 1953. It was said that 40 people were there as "guinea pigs." I resolutely reject the accusations. I believe that these accusations are primarily leveled against the fond memory of Academician Andrey Dmitriyevich

Sakharov. He was one of the organizers of the explosion. It was exactly due to his principled approach that the entire population had been evacuated.

[Question] What is happening there now?

[Petrushenko] Perhaps all of you have heard about what is happening regarding the testing ground. Indeed, an unhealthy situation has developed there. This is why the "Soyuz" Deputy Group went there. We came to the city of Kurchatov, which is 40 km away from the ground zero of nuclear explosions, and later to the testing ground. We went down to the gallery where a nuclear explosion was set off four years ago. The deputies took readings of the level of radioactivity and it was normal. A photographer from SOBESEDNİK took pictures of all of this.

I believe that the Semipalatinsk testing ground has now become the lightning rod which deflects the real problems of our life.

[Question] In late May an international congress on banning nuclear tests was held in Alma Ata. Its participants had a different opinion from yours.

[Petrushenko] Let me only recall that the United States set off yet another nuclear explosion in Nevada during the proceedings of the congress. At the congress itself the deputy chief of the U.S. Department of Defense Information Center spoke. In particular, he said that the main position of his country is: Nuclear tests are necessary "in order to maintain a credible nuclear deterrent which has ensured peace for 40 years now." He also stated the idea that he does not consider nuclear tests an evil but, on the contrary, a means of national security. The American guest called on our president to head universal nuclear normalization and resume a moratorium on nuclear testing. The following is a quote: "Everybody will applaud the Soviet Union for its leadership in the cause of peace, as well as support it because it has already demonstrated its firm determination to put an end to the arms race. In this case, having carried out our national nuclear program, we would agree to negotiations on discontinuing nuclear testing." In short, they intend to implement their nuclear program for 10 years....

[Yushenkov] In principle I agree with the concept of Major Lopatin. I would only like to add that under contemporary conditions the idea of republic armies is beginning to play an extremely important role. Armed formations already actually exist in a number of republics. This is a reality, no matter what we think of it. No matter how much we denounce the idea it is already becoming a fact. It appears to me that pondering this is very important, all the more so in that we now recognize the sovereignty of the republics.

Now for political organs. This problem has already been touched upon. A multiparty system in our country is already beginning to evolve. Under the circumstances the presence of any party organization in the Army is nonsensical. All parties are created in order to fight for

power. If these parties operate in the Army, grounds for destabilization will appear. This cannot be allowed to occur.

I may hear a quite legitimate question: Since political organs are not needed, why do I teach at the Military-Political Academy? I will answer. We cannot act as nihilists right away and destroy everything that has been created. The Army needs high-class specialists which are trained in the Military-Political Academy, in higher military-political schools. Why? Contemporary political officers are quite highly educated people. Look at how brilliantly Nikolay Semenovitch Petrushenko spoke—a political officer, a learned person who sees many problems clearly.

However, something else is at the core of the issue: Are we, party functionaries, actually needed in the Armed Forces? At present the Army needs social psychologists, psychologists, political scientists, specialists on religion and public relations.... These responsibilities should devolve to modern-day political officers, possibly, after appropriate retraining. This is the kind of system that is proposed.

However, depolitization is not the object. As I see it, it is a mistake to think that this process is depolitization. The latter is inconceivable in a political society. The Army will always be an object of political life.

[Question] What is your attitude toward the "Shield" union? Does the Army need a trade union?

[Yushenkov] Since we are talking about a professional army it does need trade unions. As far as "Shield" goes, I am familiar with many specific actions of the union. "Shield" has a right to exist, all the more so because it has already asserted itself in life. Many people's deputies of the USSR and Russia take part in its work.

[Alksnis] I was among the 17 USSR people's deputies who signed the first draft concept of the military reform. I am also a proponent of switching to a professional army. However, what kind of professionalism? We need a cautious approach here: much is unclear.

It is necessary to improve the standard of combat training of the Army. There is only one way—to enhance special skills. This means that professionals are necessary. But how are we going to make this switch? A contract soldier needs an apartment or at least a dormitory bed. At present, 170,000 families of officers and warrant officers do not have dwellings. Let us add to this at least 1.5 million soldiers and sergeants who come later to serve under contracts. So, let us look into this. Will the state be able to boost the pace of housing construction for the needs of the Army by, say, a factor of three? I doubt this.

The second point with which I categorically disagree is the approach to creating national military formations. It is easy to discourse from here from Moscow. Let us give the republics an opportunity to have their own armies,

what is so bad about this." When you are in other regions you may feel it personally. One takes a different view of the issue when a split in society begins, when the sides rally certain forces around them, including paramilitary organizations. Let us imagine that national military formations of two republics would have met on the border of Osh and Andizhan Oblasts. There were enough victims without this. More such examples can be given. Therefore, such experiments are hardly justified.

[Question] Still, armed detachments have been created in some republics. Why don't you respond to this?

[Alksnis] The "Soyuz" Deputy Group held a meeting two weeks ago. The deputies adopted an appeal to the USSR president in which they demanded that his own ukases be complied with, for example, on Lithuania where arms have not been fully surrendered to this day, and on disarming commandos in Armenia.

The "Soyuz" group has taken this position: If the president does not insist on compliance with his ukases, we will raise the issue of convening an extraordinary congress of USSR people's deputies.

[Question] From this point of view, what is your assessment of the situation in the Baltic area?

[Alksnis] I was shown my own file from an electronic data bank of one informal organization—data about me and the entire family. There was even a floor plan of my apartment.

This is a sample of how extremist forces work. Of course the leaders of the people's fronts distance themselves from such actions and do not agree that semi-military structures have already evolved. However, these structures also have weapons, including those of foreign models.

[Rutskoy] Positions with regard to the Army reform have been expressed quite clearly here. The notes I have received are such that answers to them will make it possible to discern my views as well. This is why I will begin with questions right away.

[Question] The military delegation at the Congress of USSR People's Deputies is more democratic than at the Russian congress. How do you explain this?

[Rutskoy] I disagree. We entered the time of perestroika long ago but, you would agree, there have been few results so far. This is why the representation of the military at the Russian congress tries to tackle fundamental issues which would make it possible to get at least something off the ground. This includes the building of the Armed Forces and the social protection of servicemen. We try first of all to make a professional assessment. I believe that all of us will see the results soon.

A package of laws should be worked out which not only gives everyone extensive rights but also sets forth his responsibilities. We do not have this. Name for me a

single country in the world in which a republic could freely "gird itself" with weapons, easily wave them in the streets, and kill soldiers.

All of this is indicative of the kind of power we now have. Power is also defined by the social protection of citizens. The people do not perceive such protection. Our tasks follow from this, and they are quite specific.

[Question] What is your opinion on the condition of military-patriotic upbringing?

[Rutskoy] Strange as it is, the youth publications which should impart patriotism to young men are now doing the opposite. This is just one aspect of the problem, but a quite indicative one. "Theoreticians" are already asking this question: Who do you, supposedly, intend to defend us against? If this is the case, why then do even some military men—our discussion has confirmed this—go as far as to suggest that the republics have the right to have their own armies? Is this to say that here we have nobody to defend against except in the republics?

Patriotism is a very specific notion. However, I believe that when preparing for service a young man should be sure that he is going to be socially protected in the Army as well. It is quite possible that his health will be ruined. However, having gone home, he frequently becomes useless to both the Ministry of Defense and local authorities.

[Question] How is the housing problem for reserve officers to be solved?

[Rutskoy] I believe that this issue is directly associated with the topic of our conversation today. Perhaps we should make use of the experience of Czechoslovakia and the GDR in this matter. When an officer graduates from school he writes a statement on where he would like to live after completing service, and signs a contract. Small contributions are withheld from him on a monthly basis, and when he retires from the service he is handed the keys to his apartment or house.

What about here? An individual is drafted in Moscow, stays in the service for 30 years, and comes home. He comes to the capital with the status of a "bomzh" [vagrant without fixed domicile] and they do not even want to issue a residence permit to him.

Changing this situation is also one of my tasks as a deputy.

[] It is too early to sum up the results of this discussion in which different, at times opposed, points of view were stated. The concept of military reform is still being worked on, and a discussion on it is under way on the pages of our newspaper as well. The Supreme Soviet itself will make a final assessment. We still have time. Therefore, our readers may carry on this conversation in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA. Esteemed comrades, we await your letters!

Safety Worries Rise Over Scrapping Nuclear Subs

PM0207122790 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 28 Jun 90 First Edition p 2

[Interview with Rear Admiral D. Alpatov, deputy chief of the Navy's Main Directorate for Operations and Overhauls, by own correspondent Captain First Class A. Pilipchuk: first paragraph is editorial introduction; place and date unspecified: "Where To 'Bury' Nuclear Ships?"]

[Text] As has been reported in the press, the public in the city of Sovetskaya Gavan and the settlement of Vanino has protested the work in Postovaya Bay on the reactors of decommissioned nuclear submarines. Numerous telegrams to the USSR president, the country's Supreme Soviet, the Congress of RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] People's Deputies, the Defense Ministry, and the Navy commander in chief, categorically demanding a complete ban on the work have arrived from the Far Eastern region. Just what is the threat to the people of the Far East? That was the first question to Rear Adm. D. Alpatov, deputy chief of the Navy's Main Directorate for Operations and Overhauls.

[Alpatov] Some of the mass media, in covering what has happened, have used a number of incompetent judgments liable to whip up feelings. One article talked about the military department's desire to turn Postovaya Bay into a "carving plate." Another article claimed that "work to dismantle power plants" was planned. Neither of these is true. But the idea was planted. Behind each of these frightening terms people saw a danger where none really existed. In this instance we are only talking about removing reactor cores from two decommissioned nuclear ships and putting them aboard a technical support ship. It should be stressed that this will only increase the radiation and nuclear safety of ships standing at their moorings. These operations are not only carried out on decommissioned submarines. Each nuclear ship, from the moment it is launched until the time it is decommissioned, is repeatedly "refueled" with nuclear fuel. This work has been carried out for more than 30 years at ship repair enterprises or in the nuclear submarines' area of deployment. And practice convinces us that the operation is safe enough provided the technology is strictly monitored.

[Pilipchuk] And where are the decommissioned submarines we are talking about "registered"?

[Alpatov] In Postovaya Bay. Incidentally, the areas in which nuclear submarines are based are dictated by the state's security interests and are determined by government resolution. Documents defining the procedure for work in the Navy with radioactive materials have been elaborated in accordance with basic all-Union sanitary regulations and radiation safety norms. In this connection the claim made by one newspaper about the "ecological extraterritoriality" of the military is confusing. We are prepared to ensure that there is full glasnost as regards work with radioactive substances.

[Pilipchuk] Nonetheless, Dmitry Mikhaylovich, people cannot fail to ask the following question: Today we're talking about two submarines in Sovetskaya Gavan, tomorrow there will be more than twice as many, and the day after tomorrow—as part of the arms reduction process—the number of decommissioned nuclear submarines could rise many times over. What is the procedure for scrapping them?

[Alpatov] It was laid down in 1986 by a CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolution—incidentally, it also covers nuclear-powered Ministry of the Maritime Fleet ships—and it has not been broken in this instance. But, in my view, the resolution does not yet ensure an appropriate material basis for working with a large number of ships. When the Soviet nuclear submarine fleet building program was being implemented, it was closely scrutinized by the government. But today, it seems, the problem of the mass decommissioning of nuclear-powered naval ships and their utilization have been classed as departmental problems for the Navy.

[Pilipchuk] What brings you to that conclusion?

[Alpatov] I will mention the most substantive point. The Navy command proposed that the USSR Council of Ministers, the Ministry of Nuclear Power Generation and the Nuclear Industry, and the USSR Council of Ministers State Commission for Emergency Situations set up a single sector (or firm) to collect, stockpile, and process radioactive waste and to develop with the help of high-league science the modern technology and base required to utilize ships and vessels with nuclear power plants. However, we were refused: It was thought that there was not a problem. And if there's no problem there's no money. Today it seems that the situation is changing for the better. Not so long ago V. Konovalov, minister of nuclear power generation and the nuclear industry, expressed the idea in a PRAVDA article that a corresponding state program was needed. I would go further: We need a Union law.

[Pilipchuk] Incidentally, Dmitry Mikhaylovich, KRASNAYA ZVEZDA was the first to raise the question of the need for a fundamental solution to this problem.¹ Does the problem exist in the U.S., British, French, or Canadian Navies?

[Alpatov] All naval powers with nuclear submarines have similar problems. Only the United States, as far as I am aware, has experience of burying submarines' reactor compartments. In my view, there is a need for an international exchange of experience on the mass decommissioning of nuclear submarines from navies. This would be a logical continuation of the joint efforts to cut armaments.

[Pilipchuk] One last question. In covering events in the Far East, one newspaper called naval seamen "bureaucratic optimists." What's your attitude to that?

[Alpatov] Our optimism is by no means explained by a bureaucratic approach to the job. It is based on our great

experiencing of operating nuclear power plants, our sense of responsibility, the men's level of training, and our multilayered and constant monitoring of the radiation situation. As you will understand, for us this is a question of the security of the crew members of nuclear ships and of their families living in the garrisons.

Footnotes

1. The article "Nuclear Submarines on the Scrapheap?" of 6 April this year.

Defense Committee Members Visit Northern Group

90UM0691A Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian
26 Jun 90 First Edition p 3

[Article by Colonel A. Belousov, KRASNAYA ZVEZDA special correspondent: "Meetings of Parliamentarians in Military Units"]

[Text] On 22 June members of the Defense and State Security Committee of the USSR Supreme Soviet visited the Northern Group of Forces in the course of its tour of military districts and groups of forces. In an intensive program of work, the parliamentarians devoted almost the entire day to meetings with servicemen, members of their families, and civilian employees of the Soviet Army.

In a meeting with airmen of the "Nth" unit [as published], USSR People's Deputies S. Golovin, B. Lukin, and Ye. Nemtsev talked about the work of the committee and answered questions. The people were interested not only in problems that affected them personally—housing, living conditions, and the like—but also, as they say, questions of state.

What kind of a military reform do the deputies foresee? How to put an end to "dedovshchina" [aging of recruits], protectionism, and other negative phenomena? Deputy Lukin was asked: "What do you think of the speech at the Russian party conference by Colonel General Makashov, commander of forces of the Volga-Ural Military District?" Vladimir Petrovich answered: "I share the position of the commander in principle. With the exception, perhaps, of the excessive emotionalism..." Colonel V. Bryzhakhin, an inspector of the Main Political Directorate of the Army and Navy, and Colonel A. Sheyenko, an officer of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces, also answered questions.

In another garrison Colonel V. Ochirov, deputy chairman of the committee, and USSR People's Deputy V. Vare talked to those assembled about the work of the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet and about what the committee succeeded in doing in the creation of laws aimed at ensuring the social protection of servicemen.

The meeting that was held in a tank unit by USSR People's Deputies M. Zokirov, V. Opolinskiy, and Colonel B. Podziruk was also rich in content.

Lieutenant General B. Dubynin, commander of the Northern Group of Forces, and Major General N. Domashev, chief of the Political Directorate of the Group, held an extensive conversation with the deputies.

On 28 June the Military Council of the Southern Group of Forces received the USSR people's deputies. Colonel General M. Burlakov, commander of the Southern Group of Forces, and Major General I. Mikulin, a member of the Military Council and chief of the Political Directorate of the Group of Forces, described the situation on the withdrawal of Soviet troops from the territory of Hungary as not simple. In many ways, this relates to the fact that the signing of the intergovernmental agreement was not well thought out in every way. It was signed on 10 March of this year, and literally immediately after this the first military echelon left for the East. Serious problems emerged in financial-economic computations regarding installations that were transferred to the Hungarian side.

A substantial part of the troops that are being withdrawn from Hungary will be sent to the Kiev Military District. To an appeal of the Military Council of the YuGV [Southern Group of Forces], the Supreme Soviet and the Council of Ministers of the republic replied: The Ukraine is prepared to allocate five percent of housing in addition to what has been planned. Unfortunately, a similar appeal to Belorussia has gone unanswered.

In connection with the emerging complications regarding computations on the Hungarian side, Colonel General M. Burlakov told the parliamentarians that he sees these ways of resolving the issues: Continue to withdraw troops, but not to transfer facilities being vacated and to guard them until computations are produced; or to stop the withdrawal of troops until questions that have arisen are resolved.

The statements of the representatives of the Hungarian leadership amount to the so-called "zero sum." This means that after the total withdrawal of our units and subunits from Hungary no one should claim any kind of compensation. According to the intergovernmental agreements between our countries "On the Legal Status of Soviet Forces Temporarily Situated on the Territory of the Hungarian People's Republic" of 27 May 1957 and 1 April 1958, all economic and property-financial questions were stipulated, including the procedure for transferring installations. The installations being transferred to the Hungarian side must be included there and then in the computation outline.

After the meeting of the YuGV military council, the USSR people's deputies set out for units that are to be withdrawn from Hungarian territory.

Baltic Republics**Ryzhkov Discusses Choice Facing Lithuania***LD0207175590 Belgrade TANJUG in English
1725 GMT 2 Jul 90*

[Text] Moscow, July 2 (TANJUG)—The Lithuanian side has fixed one hundred days for talks. Soviet Prime Minister Ryzhkov said and added he considered this period as sufficient for dealing with problems existing between this Baltic republic and Soviet federal authorities.

Everything hinges on the Lithuanians now, Ryzhkov said. The talks will proceed along one set of lines if the Lithuanian side agrees to the proposal that the status of the republic be regulated under a new federal agreement, but the approach will be completely different if the Lithuanian side, which should make the next move, comes out with a proposal for seceding from the Soviet Union.

Explaining why Moscow has insisted on a moratorium, Ryzhkov said that it would not have been legally possible otherwise to sit at the conference table. In his statement to the press, Ryzhkov reiterated that all the restrictions concerning Lithuania had been lifted.

Flow of Oil to Lithuania Resumes*LD0207221290 Moscow Television Service in Russian
2018 GMT 2 Jul 90*

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Excerpts] [Announcer] Oil supplies to Lithuania have at last been restored. This happened once the Lithuanian parliament had decided on a 100-day freeze on the declaration of independence. It seems probable that talks between Vilnius and Moscow will start in about two weeks' time, i.e. at the end of the 28th CPSU Congress. And so the first oil has arrived at the Mazeikiai refinery.

[Begin recording] [video shows woman reading a report to camera, then various scenes of Mazeikiai refinery].

[Correspondent E. Kurkleyte] For the time being, the refinery will take in 20,000 tonnes of oil every 24 hours, but when the whole technological process is adjusted, it will be able to take twice as much. [passage omitted] [end recording]

[Announcer] Well, let's hope that our colleague, our correspondent in Lithuania, whom you have just seen, will be able to get hold of some gasoline for the car and that she will be able to make more reports for us. The lack of gasoline for cars has been a substantial restraining factor. At any rate, our film crew has been virtually unable to leave the confines of Vilnius.

All Sanctions Against Lithuania Lifted*PM0207153390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
3 Jul 90 Morning Edition p 1*

[Unattributed report under the "INTERFAX" rubric: "Lithuania Should Have the First Say"]

[Text] Nikolay Ryzhkov, head of the Soviet Government, answered an INTERFAX correspondent's questions on the upcoming talks with Lithuania.

"The Lithuanian side set the 100-day timetable for the talks," N. Ryzhkov said. "It believes that the existing questions can be solved within that period. I think that fundamental solutions to the problem should be found during those 100 days. Everything will depend on what Lithuania's representatives bring to the talks. If they suggest defining Lithuania's special status within the USSR, that is one problem with one way of resolving it. But if they propose leaving the USSR, the scenario of the talks and their essence would be different. Therefore, I believe that the Lithuanian representatives should have the first word."

N. Ryzhkov noted that the Lithuanian parliament may extend the period of the talks if the 100-day period proves insufficient. He noted that the moratorium was necessary in order to come to the negotiating table and nothing else.

Nikolay Ryzhkov also announced, in reply to the INTERFAX correspondent's question, that all the economic restrictions which had been introduced against Lithuania have been lifted by the USSR Government.

Prunskiene Sees Talks With Moscow as Next Step*LD0207205690 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1949 GMT 2 Jul 90*

[Report by TASS correspondent Kazis Ustisila]

[Text] Vilnius, 2 July (TASS)—"Talks should be the next step," Lithuanian Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunskiene said at a press conference this evening. She informed journalists that in response to the 100-day moratorium declared by the Supreme Council of this republic on its act of independence, the Soviet Union has lifted restrictions on the supply of oil and certain other raw materials to Lithuania.

The head of the Lithuanian government today returned from a trip to Estonia and Finland. She informed journalists that Lithuania's decision on the moratorium "was received positively in these countries as a specific step towards talks."

At the same time, she noted that "an idea is being formulated to enter into talks with the USSR in accordance with a three-plus-one formula," that is, having Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia simultaneously take part in the talks with Moscow. However, in Prunskiene's view, "this is not viewed very favorably in Moscow."

"I won't undertake to predict what way out will be found," she said, "but in any case, the standpoints of all three Baltic republics will be coordinated during preparations for the talks." She reported that evidently for this purpose, a meeting of the heads of governments of these republics will be held, at which "the draft documents prepared by us, including the draft of a Lithuanian treaty with the USSR, will be jointly appraised."

Prunskiene believes that prior to the talks with the USSR it would be a good idea to hold more specific organizational meetings with Soviet leaders, to create plenipotentiary commissions and to step up their work.

"We are moving away from the declaration of independence towards its realization," she said.

Leaders Discuss Changes, Talks With Moscow

LD0207212390 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian
1900 GMT 2 Jul 90

[Summary] Today a regular joint sitting of the government of the Republic of Lithuania and the leadership of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania took place. Changes in the embargo and measures to overcome the consequences of the blockade were discussed at the sitting.

Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunskiene; Algirdas Brazauskas, Romualdas Ozolas, deputy prime ministers; Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of the Supreme Council; and Ceslovas Stankevicius, deputy chairman of the Supreme Council, took part in the work of the sitting.

Today a draft preparation plan for interstate negotiations with the Soviet Union has been discussed at the sitting of the Presidium of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania. After the draft decision has been discussed at the relevant permanent commissions it will be submitted to the Supreme Council for debates.

3 Jul Lithuanian Supreme Council Session Reported

LD0307075590

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 0700 GMT on 3 July begins carrying a live relay of the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius.

The session begins with discussion of the Supreme Council agenda for July. Deputy Sabutis says that plenary sessions will take place on the 3, 4, 5, 10, 12, 13, 17, and 19 July. On 24, 26, and 31 July the draft documents will be adopted.

Following this, items proposed to be included in the agenda are specified.

At 0714 GMT, discussion of the proposed agenda begins. By a majority of votes the proposed agenda for July is adopted.

At 0720 GMT, the agenda for 3 July is announced as follows:

1. Draft Law on Taxation of Individuals and Businesses.
2. Draft Statute of the Police Academy of the Republic of Lithuania, first reading.
3. Amendments to the Code of Civil and Administrative Rights' Violations.
4. Concerning the Agrarian Reform.
5. Issues related to the Law on Enterprises.
6. Draft Law on Annual Holidays for Workers and Employees.
7. Payments into the budget of the USSR.

The agenda is adopted at 0725 GMT.

At 0726 GMT, Deputy A. Rudys begins his report on the first item of the agenda.

Commentator on Party Congress Eve Discussion

OW0107124890 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1800 GMT 27 Jun 90

[Commentator Mikhail Osokin commentary, from the "120 Minutes" program; recorded over montage of video shots showing the RSFSR Communist Party Congress and several other major meetings held recently in Moscow; speakers are all shown at the RSFSR Communist Party Conference and identified by screen caption]

[Text] [Announcer] Yesterday Vadim Andreyevich Medvedev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, held a press conference on the results of discussion preceding the 28th CPSU Congress. He denied rumors about a possible postponement of the congress to a later date, but said that the final decision on this question can be adopted only by a CPSU Central Committee plenum that will be held Friday.

You will learn more details about the press conference from the "Vremya" program, but now take a look at how our commentator Mikhail Osokin viewed the discussion preceding the congress.

[Osokin] Events on the eve of the congress are giving the world press much food for thought. The main question is: Will there be a split in the CPSU and what will arise as a result? The LONDON SUNDAY TIMES states that if the party does not carry out reform within its ranks, supporters of the Democratic Platform of the CPSU will withdraw from the congress, and that will change the country's political life forever. According to the newspaper, approximately 1.5 million members of the CPSU would then follow them. In the opinion of the British television company ITN, the party is now yielding to a simple truth—that which suits one part does not suit the others. Indeed, this very clearly was displayed at the Russian conference of communists, where they argued heatedly about everything—from the course of perestroika to the name of the party. [video cuts to V.I.

Ladygin, locomotive engineer of the Transbaykal Railroad, addressing the RSFSR Communist Party congress]

[Ladygin] I stress, CPSU, insofar as we believe the party's name should not be changed.

[Osokin] In the opinion of representatives of the Democratic Platform, it is also necessary to renounce this mark of a totalitarian party. [video cuts to V.N. Lysenko, coreporter for the Democratic Platform]

[Lysenko] The unitary principle of the party's structure, the nomenklatura system, and the old compromised name.

[Osokin] The members of this platform made their positions sufficiently clear. It is necessary to develop democratization in the country and in the party. The party should renounce not only its old name, but also its political privileges, the monopoly on only one ideology, and most of the property it does not own. It is more difficult to speak of the position of the Democratic Platform's opponents: for example, the leaders of the Leningrad Initiative Congress of the RCP—the Russian Communist Party. Their spokesman Tyulkin gave more of a description of the situation than an appraisal. [video cuts to show A. Tyulkin, coreporter for the initiative congress of communists of Russia]

[Tyulkin] Both those who are for communism and those who are against communism, they are all members of our party. [applause] However, he who views this from above and says: Pluralism is good, he is the party's chief ideologue.

[Osokin] However, earlier the leaders of the Leningrad congress had already formulated their approach very clearly. According to the newspapers, they insisted, for example, on calling the journal OGONEK and other publications, including PRAVDA, cancerous tumors that must be excised. They demanded that broadcasts of corrupting music in Russia be forbidden and that all programs be coordinated with the RCP Central Committee. As a matter of fact, some very unexpected attacks also were heard at the conference, for example, concerning objections to proclaiming the RCP. [video cuts to show Tyulkin]

[Tyulkin] They stem from two categories of people, if you will. First of all...[changes thought] and why? It is because the comrades in question pronounce the word Russian poorly. [applause]

[Osokin] Some journalists saw in this phrase obvious chauvinism, because in their view it was completely clear what was being talked about. Council of Ministers Chairman Ryzhkov said in an interview that it was frightening for him to hear applause in response to these words. It looks as if it was also frightening for many other party delegates, and for the most diverse of reasons. Some fear the way discipline has been eroding around the country. [video cuts to V.V. Chikin, chief editor of SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA]

[Chikin] This is the shadow of malicious meetings, the blasphemous demonstrations this past 1 May, the shadow of those separatist and nationalist acts in various contiguous republics, and provocative draft laws put forward a mere stone's throw from here.

[Osokin] However, others, it seems, are alarmed by something else—calls to temper glasnost. [video cuts to N.V. Bystrov, secretary of the party committee of the Moscow Road Transport Institute]

[Bystrov] In my view a dangerous tendency is appearing in society today. Sentiments desiring strong power, maybe even an iron hand, are emerging.

[Osokin] There is also alarm at the fact that the leader of the newly-formed Communist Party of Russia is Ivan Polozkov who, in the elegant words of the newspaper IZVESTIYA, has a clearly defined reputation. At the same time, there is much speculation in Western newspapers about the leader of the entire party. In recent days Gorbachev has met with sharp criticism from the most diverse quarters. Some observers point in particular to increasing pressure from the right. In the view of America's BOSTON GLOBE, a very interesting point is being reached. Gorbachev's reaction to the conservatives' attacks, suggests the newspaper, could begin a rapid shift toward the reformist camp and an alliance with Yeltsin. There is much speculation concerning the possibility of Gorbachev leaving his post as leader of the CPSU. According to the American television company ABC, he could even win out if he moves away from those who ABC terms conservative party bureaucrats.

Well, all of this is only speculation which I will leave completely to the consciences of its authors. Still, one thing is certain: At the upcoming congress, a battle for the future of the CPSU will unfold. In any event, it will not be the same party that existed for so many decades. The current situation, when arguments and contradictions have seized the entire party, frightens some very much. [video shows unidentified deputy speaking]

[Deputy] ...Or perhaps they believe that there are a lot of us, Comrade deputies, it could turn out that when we look behind us we will not see any of these 18 million people behind our backs.

[Announcer] At the news conference Vadim Andreyevich Medvedev said: There is no reason to see tragedy in the departure of individuals from the party. That is not a split.

Baltic Party Leaders Hold Press Conference

PM0207115190 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA
PRAVDA in Russian 30 Jun 90 p 1

[TASS report: "Will They Go Another Way?"]

[Text] The meeting of delegations from the independent Latvian Communist Party, the Lithuanian Communist Party, and the Estonian Communist Party in Riga lasted for two days. Yesterday their leaders—I. Kezbers, A. Brazauskas, and E. Sillari—held a press conference.

Journalists were told that a protocol on cooperation between the parties had been signed. It was decided to hold such meetings regularly. A joint information center will be set up.

Answering journalists' questions about the forthcoming 28th CPSU Congress, the press conference participants stressed that, in their opinion, its results—who will be at the party's helm and how the CPSU will "move to a general political system"—will be of the greatest importance for communists.

Assessing their relations with those parties which have remained faithful to CPSU positions, the leaders of the independent communist parties stressed that they do not and could not have any close ties with them because they are divided by the most important point—the goals for which they are striving.

At the same time, an appeal was adopted to the 28th CPSU Congress containing a call for the democratization of relations between parties. This appeal will be taken to Moscow by delegates from the Estonian Communist Party.

Letter on Latvian Party Support for Gorbachev

90UN2026B Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian
22 May 90 p 1

[“Letter of the Central Committee of the Latvian Communist Party to All Communists and Citizens of the Latvian SSR”]

[Text] Comrade communists!

Fellow countrymen!

The Central Committee of the Latvian Communist Party considers it necessary to state with all responsibility and conviction that in connection with the Declaration “On Restoration of the Independence of the Latvian Republic” adopted 4 May 1990 by the Latvian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet, a fundamentally new political situation has been created in our society.

The declaration affects the interests of all inhabitants of the republic. Each of us senses and understands that the ship of state has charted a new, exceedingly dangerous course. Let us ask ourselves a simple question—in whose interests is all of this? In the name of what? At what cost?

What do we see on the political scene of the republic Supreme Soviet? Essentially, a legal foundation is feverishly being established there from which a transition will take place to the capitalist path of development. An unprecedented campaign has been unleashed to discredit the concept of socialism. Social demagoguery has reached unheard-of dimensions and an attack is being waged against those sound forces of the republic which consider the rupture of state ties with the USSR at this time to be unjustified.

The position of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee on the question of the republic's state status is clear and precise to the limit. We advocate full acknowledgment of the right of the Latvian nation to self-determination, the natural right of the people of Latvia to form a sovereign, independent state. Under present conditions, however, we believe that a change in the status of the republic can be achieved through proper agreements with the USSR on the basis of the USSR Law “On Delimitation of Powers Between the USSR and Federation Entities,” and its secession can be effected on the basis of Article 72 of the USSR Constitution and the USSR Law “On Procedure for Resolving Issues Related to Secession of a Union Republic from the USSR.”

We are in favor of the option of a future Latvia being determined by universal referendum on a legal, constitutional basis. In our view there cannot and should not be any other way. We must look the truth in the eye and see that the human destiny, culture, and economy of Latvia, a part of the USSR for half a century, are tied together in the closest manner with all the republics, with the entire Union.

This is why the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee is expressing its agreement with the assessments and measures contained in the Ukase of the USSR President “On the Declaration of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet ‘On Restoration of the Independence of the Latvian Republic,’” and is calling upon communists and all citizens of the republic to effect its implementation.

The centuries-old history of mankind has many times confirmed one irrefutable truth: In politics, as in any other sphere of activity, one must not take steps without having first considered their consequences. We ask those who have initiated the rupture in state ties with the USSR and the change in the republic's political status: Have the consequences of such a step been completely thought out? The economic, political, cultural, and moral consequences? Is this step supported by the capabilities and interests of the Latvian people, of all people residing in this land?

We believe that adoption of the declaration by the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet is capable of hurling all of us backward. It threatens to bring about mass unemployment, civil disorder, a deterioration in our way of life.

Responsibility for the destiny of Latvia lies upon all of us. Each of us must make a determination. Are we prepared today to resolutely oppose the separatist, destructive forces we see? Or will these forces succeed in thrusting an exceedingly pernicious course of action on the people, tossing them in the final analysis into the abyss of general national crisis? This is precisely the question we are faced with today.

The Latvian Communist Party Central Committee again affirms its steadfast position of principle—any decision on the question of the state status of the Latvian SSR must bring no harm to any segment of the republic

population. We will continue to resolutely fight in support of this position using every political means at our disposal.

[Signed] The Central Committee of the Latvian Communist Party

Opposition to Latvian Declaration Voiced

90UN2017A Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian
15 May 90 p 1

[Resolution of representatives of the aktiv of labor collectives and social and sociopolitical organizations of the city of Yelgava and the "Soyuz" deputies group of the city soviet of people's deputies: "Our Attitude Toward the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet Declaration 'On the Restoration of an Independent Republic of Latvia'"]

[Text] We, representatives of the aktiv of labor collectives and social and sociopolitical organizations of the city of Yelgava and the "Soyuz" deputies group of the city soviet of people's deputies, while supporting the constitutional right of the people of Latvia to form a sovereign independent state and fully acknowledging the right of a nation to self-determination to the point of secession, protest the anticonstitutional declaration of independence imposed upon the people of Latvia by the deputies of the NFL [People's Front of Latvia] faction.

The declaration is a precursor to an anti-Soviet, antisocialist coup d'etat and it is an illegal act contradicting the Constitutions of the Latvian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] and the USSR and the USSR Law "On a Procedure for Resolving Questions Related to Secession of a Union Republic From the USSR."

The declaration of independence contradicts the basic interests of the workers of Latvia.

Restoration of the validity of the individual articles of the 1922 Republic of Latvia Constitution on the territory of the Latvian SSR shows a desire to restore the bourgeois system with all the consequences that follow.

We demand that the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet:

1. Repeal the 4 May 1990 ruling of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet directed at overthrowing the socialist system in Latvia;
2. and resolve the question of Latvia's secession from the USSR by conducting a national vote (referendum).

In the event that our legal demands are not adopted, as voters we reserve the right:

To give a vote of no confidence to the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet and the city soviet of people's deputies, which are not expressing the will and the basic interests of the workers;

and to form our own organs of Soviet power.

We remind the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet that full responsibility for the possible consequences of the unfolding events will fall upon the deputies who have adopted the anticonstitutional acts.

We appeal to each collective, each worker, each inhabitant of the city of Yelgava, and the whole republic to express its attitude toward the antisocialist declaration, to show concern for the fate of the republic, and not to allow a return of the slavery of forced labor.

[Dated] Yelgava, 10 May 1990.

(This resolution was sent to the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet; the editorial board of the newspapers TSINYA, SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA, and YELGAVAS ZINETAJS; and all the city's labor collectives.)

Latvian USSR Constitution Group Goals Viewed

90UN2026A Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian
22 May 90 p 1

[Article by Yu. Glants: "Democracy—Power of the People"]

[Text] A committee has been established to defend the constitutions and rights of citizens of the USSR and the Latvian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic].

On Sunday 1,493 representatives of labor collectives and social organizations from all cities and 22 rayons of the republic, people of 23 nationalities, assembled at the Constituent Conference of the Committee for Defending the Constitutions and Rights of Citizens of the USSR and the Latvian SSR. The assembly hall of the Riga House of Political Education could not hold all those who wished to attend. Many stood in the aisles or sat on the balcony steps. They filled the little hall.

The report of P. Nefedov, chairman of the republic United Council of Labor Collectives, and the addresses of people's deputies and party workers, production workers and veterans, city and rural inhabitants, all dealt with what had brought them here—primarily, anxiety at the political situation in the republic, alarm over the future of their children, an unwillingness to accept the changing state system, loss of social guarantees for the working class, living conditions deteriorating before their eyes...

Anticipating the conference and then commenting on its results, certain of the republic mass media were fomenting the idea that this was a committee "for defending the Brezhnev Constitution and rights of USSR citizens which this Constitution was unable to safeguard from the moment of its adoption right up to this day." When you want to sting someone more painfully, you don't make any special effort to resort to common sense. Any constitution is the Basic Law according to which the state and society live. And mankind has not been able to devise any other rational alternative—it is either law or lawlessness, order or anarchy, democracy or dictatorship.

The task of the first order of the Committee for Defending the Constitutions and Rights of Citizens of the USSR and the Latvian SSR will be to organize the collection of voter signatures for the conduct of a referendum on the question of the state and socio-political status of our republic. This must be decided not by the politicians, but by the people themselves, and it must be decided in strict conformance with universally accepted legal norms.

The committee's second task is to protect the legal rights and interests of citizens. We have already heard reports of incidents of their violation from various places.

The aims and tasks of the new organization were set forth in the address of A. Rubiks, USSR and Latvian SSR people's deputy, first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee, and in the presentations of a number of other delegates. The conference elected the republic committee consisting of 75 individuals, reserving a portion of the seats for representatives of rural areas. A. Rubiks was elected chairman of the committee.

The conference adopted a declaration on establishment of the republic Committee for Defending the Constitutions and Rights of Citizens of the USSR and Latvian SSR, an appeal to the President of the USSR, an appeal to the people of Soviet Latvia, an appeal to the first RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Congress of People's Deputies, a statement on the mass media, and a letter to the United Nations, the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, and the Euro-Parliament.

The committee may be reached at the following telephone numbers: 32-09-44, 24-50-52.

Latvian Supreme Soviet Suspends Union Budget Law
*LD3006031490 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1400 GMT 29 Jun 90*

[Video report by correspondent N. Kasyanova in Riga, including interview with Latvian Finance Minister Z. Silinsh, date not given; from the "Vremya" newscast—recorded]

[Text] [Announcer] As we have already reported, the Latvian Supreme Soviet was suspended on the territory of the republic one of the articles of the Union Law on the USSR State Budget for 1990. Now, from 1 July, Latvia will have a 40-hour working week, and a 35-hour week for those working in hazardous conditions, for mothers of large families, and for women with handicapped children. This reportage is from Riga.

[Kasyanova] In addition to this decision, a four-week holiday entitlement has been established for all categories of workers, though this may be reduced to three weeks where a person is guilty of various kinds of violations. This decision comes into force on 1 January 1991. A non-budget social assistance fund is being set up

to improve the material situation of poorly-off sections of the population, and for drug addiction and alcoholism prevention work. For this, admittedly, an excise tax—as the economists call it—has had to be introduced: From 1 July tobacco and beer prices will be doubled, and the price of alcoholic drinks will rise by 30 percent. The full budget deficit will amount to almost R157,000,000 [rubles]. [Kasyanova addresses Z. Silinsh, Latvian minister of finance] How are you actually going to solve such a difficult problem at the present time?

[Silinsh] The session has decided to alter the relations, the relationship, with the Union budget. The proportion deducted from various kinds of income for the Union budget has been changed—as regards turnover tax, we are now leaving the republic with 82.1 percent, and the income taxation of manual and office workers has been scrapped completely. Today a second law of great importance for our republic is being given a second reading, and it is no coincidence that it has been included in the list of priority legislation—the law on budget rights.

[Kasyanova] The Latvian Supreme Soviet has also decided to transfer the so-called transport tax, paid by owners of means of transport, to the republic. [video shows Latvian Supreme Soviet in session, interview with Silinsh in auditorium]

Attacks on Journalists' Rights Protested

*90UN2026C Riga SOVIETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian
22 May 90 p 1*

["Declaration on the Mass Media"]

[Text] Attacks upon the central mass media have been ongoing for a long period of time, carried out by the Latvian People's Front and those mass media which have taken up its positions, and also in recent times by deputies in the republic Supreme Soviet from the Latvian People's Front. They present unfounded claims of alleged bias in the reporting of events taking place in the Latvian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic].

The congress is also examining such actions as violations of journalists' rights to freely express their opinions in their publications. This runs counter to universally accepted international norms regarding functioning of the mass media.

The congress expresses its categorical protest against encroachments on the rights of journalists to creative freedom. The congress is on the side of all workers in the mass media who support democracy and human rights, who advocate defending the constitutions and rights of citizens of the USSR and the Latvian SSR, and protecting Soviet federalism. Delegates of the congress reserve the right to broadly disseminate to the public of our country and the world any instances of victimization of progressive journalists.

[Signed] **The Congress of Representatives of Labor Collectives and Social Organizations Advocating Defending the Constitutions and Rights of Citizens of the USSR and the Latvian SSR.**

[Dated] Riga, 20 May 1990.

Estonia's Ruutel Greets RSFSR Congress

90UN2103A Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA
in Russian 1 Jun 90 p 1

[Appeal to the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies by A. Ruutel, chairman of the Republic of Estonia Supreme Soviet]

[Text] The republic of Estonia Supreme Soviet welcomes the freely elected popular representation of Russia. We have embarked on a common difficult path of liberating our peoples from the shackles of the system, the path of creating a society in which the people elect their representatives by free expression of their wishes, and the democratically elected representation serves its people. We have embarked on a path leading away from material and spiritual impairment to a life worthy of man.

The Estonian people have been and will remain your neighbor. Not only on account of their smallness, but also by virtue of their common sense, the Estonian people have always, in all their endeavors, respected the interests of the peoples of Russia. Striking testimony to this was the year 1919 when assistance to General Yudenich on the part of the Finns and Estonians could, according to V.I. Lenin, have led to the fall of Petrograd. Generals Mannerheim and Laidoner recognized that such interference in Russia's internal affairs would have done irreparable damage to relations between our peoples, and refrained from such a step. Estonians have at all times conducted a struggle for their existence. We are proud that 71 years ago we were able to create our own national state. This state was and could be for Russia just as good a neighbor as is Finland.

We are struggling together for liberation from a grim legacy. We were equally tormented by a brutal regime which deprived the peoples of the right to express their will. This regime brought down hitherto unprecedented violence on the peoples, which it considered its property, as it were.

With its roots in the past, the imperialist policy 50 years ago deprived Estonia of freedom and plunged Russia into the most profound stagnation. The way of thinking whereby the indicator of the might of the state is the size of territory controlled and the number of subjects will never allow Russia to become a genuinely powerful state, for the power of a state in the modern world is determined by the level of economic and technological development and the level of democracy. In the name of your and our liberty we summon you to the struggle against imperial thinking, which has enmeshed us both.

The Estonian people have no claims against the Russian people for grim ordeals have fallen to the lot of both of

us. We declare that those who in Estonia are sowing national discord do not express the will of the Republic of Estonia. The Estonian people wish to be an equal ally and good neighbor of the peoples of Russia. May our economic, social, and cultural relations develop on an equal and mutually profitable basis. We respect and recognize the interests of the peoples of Russia and hope that you also will understand our aspiration to be an independent state. We propose the creation of a joint commission of our supreme soviets for an extension of the cooperation of our peoples, proceeding from mutual interests.

In the republic of Estonia the Russian national minority will be guaranteed all civil rights and ensured cultural autonomy. All rules stipulated by international law will be observed in respect of the Russian people who wish to live in Estonia as citizens of Russia. The border between our states should be just as symbolic as it has today become between the states of West Europe.

We wish you success in your activity for the good of Russia and in the name of an improvement in the life of your people and the creation of genuinely neighborly relations between our peoples.

[Signed] A. Ruutel, chairman of the Republic of Estonia Supreme Soviet.

[Dated] Tallinn, 14 May 1990.

Estonian Politician on Independence, Gorbachev

AU0207182290 Vienna DIE PRESSE in German
2 Jul 90 p 9

[Interview with Marju Lauristin, USSR Supreme Soviet deputy and founding member of the Estonian Independence Front, by Irene Miller in Vienna; date not given: "We Want Market Economy"]

[Text] [Miller] Your country is pursuing its independence no less energetically than Lithuania. Nevertheless, you do not have an economic blockade or such dramatic attempts to start negotiations with Moscow. Why?

[Lauristin] We have made less symbolic steps than Lithuania; on 30 March we did not proclaim our independence but stated that we are an occupied country and that we want to initiate steps to reestablish our sovereignty. And Moscow threatened us, too, with economic measures. But this took place at a time when two to three weeks of economic blockade against Lithuania had not had the slightest effect. Therefore, in our case threats were the only thing and were not followed by any specific measures of blockade.

However, Moscow has blocked our foreign accounts in order to take control of our financial assets. Moscow declared our transition laws illegal. But in our country these laws are valid.

We went even further. We passed a law on private property and a law on immigration. We are preparing to issue our own currency. We are dissolving our relations

with Soviet institutions, such as the police. We are untying all knots. But we do it in a less demonstrative way than the Lithuanians.

[Miller] If independence means that your trade with the Soviet Union will be based on world market prices in the future, as Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev recently indicated—how can your country manage this?

[Lauristin] Yes, we can manage it. In such a case we must not only buy at world market prices but we can also sell at these prices. At the moment we are exporting our products to the Soviet Union practically for free. It is an unnatural, colonial economy. We have to build up a market economy. Then we will also deal more economically with our resources.

With his threat Gorbachev shows that he actually does not want a market economy. We want it. We can afford it. We are not afraid. The economic transition will be difficult, but our people are willing to work and to wait for prosperity. We are prepared. But we want clear prospects.

[Miller] How do you assess the West's attitude toward you, and in particular toward Lithuania?

[Lauristin] We all have the feeling: The West is looking only at Gorbachev and not at the processes which are taking place in the Soviet Union. But we cannot break Moscow's silence without Western help. It is incredible—we have such a strong strategic position, but everyone is just staring at Moscow. If our Baltic problem is not solved, Moscow cannot overcome Stalin's legacy. How can the West trust in the democratic changes in the Soviet Union in this case? Actually we are a test case.

[Miller] You have a problem throughout the country....

[Lauristin] Well, it is not an ethnic problem, it is a political one. About two-thirds of all Russians in Estonia belong to the military or work in the arms industry. Their existence depends on the maintenance of Soviet power in the Baltic States. They are vanguards of the Russian empire, they are commanded by Moscow. We have documents which prove this. But the other third of the Russians in Estonia have made a clear choice in favor of independence.

Estonian Banking System Seen as 'Pure Illusion'

LD3006105690 Tallinn PAEVALEHT in Estonian
14 Jun 90 p 3

[Article by Juhan Hindov entitled: "Is It Still Realistic for Estonia To Have Kroons by Christmas," subtitled "Interview With Ministers Jaak Leimann and Endel Lippmaa]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] One of the most essential issues for the Estonian economy is a monetary reform which would constitute a changeover to our own currency, in addition to developing an Estonian banking

system with—first and foremost—an active involvement on the part of the central bank, the Estonian Bank. [passage omitted]

Expressing their viewpoints on what was discussed at the government session are Mr. Jaak Leimann, minister of economy, and Mr. Endel Lippmaa, minister.

As is known, Mr. Rein Otsason, president of the Estonian Bank, issued a promise that there will be an Estonian currency by the end of this year, by Christmas to be more precise. Is this a reality and can people believe in this promise?

E. Lippmaa: It will be quite impossible to put Estonian kroons into circulation for Christmas Eve. In my opinion one may have kroons printed, but we must take into account that this is but a negligible sum of what it would cost to establish Estonia's own currency system, perhaps 0.1 percent.

One cannot set up a bank in the way the Estonian Bank was planned, nor a realistically applied ownership law which would really protect private ownership. [passage omitted]

J. Leimann: This story of us having our own currency by Christmas has only socio-psychological importance; it has no economic content scientifically nor practically. [passage omitted]

Has the activity of the Estonian Bank (it was set up 1 January 1990) so far provided anything positive toward the Estonian economy?

J. Leimann: It seems to me that we have created for ourselves a phenomenon of the Estonian Bank and conduct business as if it was a powerful bank. This, however, is a pure illusion. The Estonian Bank is fact does not exist. The present Estonian Bank is a small research group which is only playing out a banking system.

Today's reality in respect of the Estonian Bank is that something is being drafted, researched; there is travel involved and matters are being clarified.

Those 10 or so specialists who at present comprise the Estonian Bank cannot do more than that. [passage omitted]

Estonia's Titma Discusses Yeltsin, Gorbachev

90UN2105A Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA
in Russian 2 Jun 90 p 3

[Report on interview with Deputy of the Supreme Soviet of Estonia Mikk Titma by Nelli Kuznetsova; date and place not specified: "Mikk Titma: 'We Behave as Constructive Opposition...'"]

[Text] [Kuznetsova] It is known that at the recent congress of the People's Front of Estonia the idea was voiced to establish the status of an honorary adviser and offer it to B. Yeltsin. I saw the explosion of applause and

the burst of satisfaction and joy which followed a report on the election of B. Yeltsin in the Supreme Soviet of Estonia. I know how thoroughly the text of the messages of greetings to him is being prepared, and how meticulously voting proceeded for all members of the small delegation which is going to the Congress of People's Deputies of Russia on behalf of the Supreme Soviet of Estonia. You are also going to Moscow with this delegation... Tell me how you explain this interest in Estonia in the fact of Yeltsin's election? What is the significance of this event? How will it influence the subsequent course of events?

[Titma] The election of Yeltsin changes the situation in the country abruptly in, I would say, three aspects. The first aspect which is, incidentally, the most painful for Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev—Yeltsin definitely is an independent political figure. In essence, this is the separation of powers, to be sure, not in the classical sense, into legislative, executive, and judicial, but their separation, or rather distribution, between actual forces. If we are to call a spade a spade, we should say that Russia is no longer in the hands of Mikhail Sergeyevich. This is the first element. The second element is that until now Gorbachev was still higher than the rest of them. "All the rest of them" were for him players of a lower rank of sorts, not in the pejorative sense, of course. It is just that he controlled the environment to such a degree that he could always balance the situation, say, he could play up Ligachev against Yeltsin, or Bakatin against someone else. After all, he also put together the Presidential Council with the most varied figures. However, he put on it Yakovlev and Yarin, that is, he succeeded in balancing political forces in all such sociopolitical collective organs. This gave him the freedom to maneuver. However, the result of Yeltsin's election is exactly that a figure and an internal political force has now appeared to which he has to talk **on an equal footing**. This is, so to say, a **personal** political aspect which nonetheless changes profoundly the entire domestic political situation.

[Kuznetsova] Until recently, it has been believed that Gorbachev is almost the only centrist... He is sort of in the center of the circle on the periphery of which there are implacable and at times mutually exclusive forces. He tries to bring all of them together on common ground in the name of common interests and... loses his popularity by virtue of this. Meanwhile, Yeltsin is a radical, and in general an extreme figure....

[Titma] Even this is not the point, it is not the point who is on the left and on the right... The point is that until recently Mikhail Sergeyevich has been virtually the only one at his level. Now he must talk to prominent, independent people in their own right as equals. This is Sobchak in Leningrad, Popov in Moscow, and, finally, Yeltsin...

Let us be honest. Gorbachev has already become a part of the history of the world, and he will remain so. As they say, this is as plain as can be. Gorbachev has not yet become a part of the history of Russia, specifically

Russia. Of course, he may yet become a part of the history of Russia as its son if he shares power. I think that his weakest spot is exactly that he has not shared power until now. For example, he has not let Ryzhkov become a prime minister...

[Kuznetsova] Genuinely, actually, really?

[Titma] Yes. In general, he has closed off both the party and the Supreme Soviet to all such powerful, **politically** powerful figures. He has always assumed responsibility himself only. However, at present the situation is too difficult. At present, Russia is in such a state that it can lose the empire. East Europe is actually already gone. The issue of republics will also become imminent. This is unavoidable. Many Russians perceive this as the disintegration of the country. However, it is even worse than that. After all, there is nothing to replace it with... Gorbachev has not given him, the Russian man, anything instead of it. Under the circumstances, it would be very unwise to retain all responsibility personally. After all, if you have all the power, you also have responsibility... This is why I am saying that Gorbachev may become a part of the history of Russia only if he now shares this responsibility with other people, because now in Russia top leaders will be responsible for Russia—in Moscow, in Leningrad, but not him... On the one hand, it is a loss for him, while on the other hand it is an asset. By yielding power, he also yields responsibility. This is salvation of sorts because another half year later he could become a lost, tragic figure... He was rescued, and rescued essentially against his own will.

Finally, the third aspect. Strange as it may be, Gorbachev, who was the one to begin perestroika, has been unable to overcome two things to this day. He believes even now that communist ideology may win under these historical circumstances. Unfortunately, it must be acknowledged objectively that the past 70 years and a government which does not take into account the voice of the people—in broad terms, both in the social and nationality aspects—have left a mark. For example, at present I am very happy for reasons of domestic policy that Yeltsin has won. I was very much afraid of the coming of anticommunism in Russia. This wave will still become stronger. However, the fact that Yeltsin has come to power will greatly delay the appearance of this wave. This is like the People's Front in Estonia... That is, it is a sensible force which will act proceeding from the real situation and objective interests, drawing into this in the process many people who, let us say, are itching to get into politics. Of course, there are all sorts among them, from careerists and exhibitionists to business people. However, these are new people who are definitely more capable than the old cadres, and on the whole this is a factor which stabilizes the country. Yeltsin will overcome what Gorbachev has not been able to overcome...

[Kuznetsova] In general, it is difficult for an active leader to retain universal sympathy, especially at a time that difficult. After all, it is absolutely clear that in real politics nobody ever gives everything to everybody right

away. Until recently, Yeltsin has had the advantageous position of "the shadow leader" who criticized sharply everything that was and was not done. However, there are authoritarian leanings which trouble many people. On one occasion, Gavriil Popov referred to the position of Yeltsin as authoritarian conservative avant-garde. To be sure, it was two years ago. Yeltsin has changed a lot as a leader and a politician since then. He has a very strong crew. This is very important. However, despotism, even certain adventurism, and abrasiveness—everything that is clearly seen in him—could it have really gone away altogether?

[Titma] It is another issue, and it is secondary.

[Kuznetsova] As little as one and a half or two years ago, commentators predicted that if perestroika made poor progress, the popularity of Yeltsin would increase, and it would decline if perestroika made good progress because it would also be shared by other vigorous activists of perestroika. Their predictions have come true.

[Titma] Yes, and it will become even more difficult... Indeed, Yeltsin's personality traits which you have mentioned are there. These very traits may be his downfall. However, at present something else is important. A politician has come along who has acknowledged that the party cannot be salvaged, that communist ideology cannot be salvaged, at least in its form to date. He will make a sensible policy on the basis of specific interests, approaching it pragmatically.

To be sure, the advent of Yeltsin cannot but affect the authority of Gorbachev. Gorbachev will lose considerable political weight. After all, even now the Americans understand that they are talking to a politician who does not fully hold sway in his own country.

[Kuznetsova] Will this affect negotiations between Gorbachev and Bush?

[Titma] Undoubtedly.

[Kuznetsova] Also in conjunction with the Baltic issue?

[Titma] Certainly... On Malta it was agreed in principle that the United States would not interfere if the issues of the Baltic area were solved by political and economic methods (hence, incidentally, the blockade of Lithuania which, incidentally, cannot be viewed as a reasonable step), whereas at present the situation may take a different turn...

[Kuznetsova] We are approaching here what is, perhaps, the main issue. What does Yeltsin's coming to power in Russia do for other republics, for Estonia? Have the republics been given hope that their problems—sovereignty and independence—will be solved?

[Titma] Undoubtedly...

[Kuznetsova] Does the applause in the Supreme Soviet signify just that—the understanding that there is hope now? Yeltsin has already proclaimed the sovereignty of

Russia. Apparently this will automatically solve the problems of the independence of others, including Estonia.

[Titma] Of course. In general, I believe that as a pragmatist Yeltsin is going to build his relations with the republics in a completely different manner. For example, what does Armenia do for Russia, especially at present, when blood is being shed there again? After all, Russia pays for Armenia, also by maintaining troops there, and in many other ways. This is like keeping money in the bank without having an opportunity to use it, and on top of that having them curse you for it. It is not done that way in the contemporary world.

Estonia at least gives Russia something. However, I am a skeptic, and I think that at present we still live at the expense of others in some sense. Therefore, a serious advantage does not accrue to Russia. After all, the situation is such that Russia is exactly the one to incur the greatest expenditures in the country—it maintains the army, the KGB, and other union organs. On top of that, it pays subsidies to the republics. This makes no sense.

What is going to happen if Estonia is given independence now? First of all, Estonia is interested in Russia's market more than the latter is interested in Estonia...

[Kuznetsova] However, many of our movements and political leaders seem not to understand it...

[Titma] This is not important. As soon as Estonia becomes an independent republic, it will be objectively tied to Russia. After all, this is the main issue—to whom are we to sell? Some people may have illusions and aspirations of some kind, but objective reality compels us to act in a specific manner rather than otherwise. All anti-Sovietism and Russophobia will go away because a genuine partnership will come about.

[Kuznetsova] Apparently when a market economy develops?

[Titma] Yes, though a market economy is very complex too. The way in which Gorbachev and Ryzhkov have now conceived its implementation may bring about a disaster. Let us trace the progress of economic thought. At the beginning of perestroika, A. Aganbegyan was the main adviser to Gorbachev on such issues. He is a sly scientist who was able to advance himself by clearly pointing out the economic issues which arise right now, this very minute. If you will, he was good for the time of stagnation. However, when it became necessary to produce economic results, the lack of depth in his constructs and his economic unsoundness became apparent.

Subsequently, Primakov, Arbatov, and some others came along. Abalkin is a theoretician as well; he tried to improve the planned economic system by introducing some elements of a market economy. However, he is also retiring from the scene by now. Bunich and Petrakov have now come along, i.e., scientists who know specific

economics. They see that salvation is in a market, pure market. However—it is very important—they do not think IN SOCIAL TERMS. If a market is introduced at once in a huge country like the Soviet Union horrible poverty will set in in some regions. In a certain sense, Moscow, Leningrad, and Georgia will rob, say, the Far East, Siberia, and Central Asia. We cannot do without regional protectionism; that is, a protective economic policy which shelters local production from external competition. Many regions will not be able to survive without it. After all, everyone will strive to only sell there, without buying anything from these regions. What will this bring about? Unemployment and poverty. This is frightening. The market may only be introduced in the union by dividing the country into regions which will have protective mechanisms for producers from these regions. Otherwise, better-quality and cheaper goods from, say, the Baltic area will crowd out local goods, to say nothing of Moscow and Leningrad which can sell their goods in any point of the Union. However, they will not make purchases... I repeat that a Union market may only be built on the basis of regional markets. This aspect has not been understood yet.

[Kuznetsova] Does the concept of republic independence objectively grow into the idea of the need for a regional market in this instance?

[Titma] Exactly. Regional markets are needed first of all in the regions of Russia itself. At present, nobody is thinking about employment here. We have always had it. However, the situation is going to be very different when the market economy is introduced and if these mechanisms protecting local producers are not introduced. People who lose work and, consequently, their means of support will begin to take part in social disturbances... Therefore, this is a major social issue.

What do I mean by this? Why did, for example, the economists advising the leadership of the country change? Initially, just competent specialists were required, just knowledge... At present, economic expertise must be merged with social expertise. What is going to happen? How will the people behave?

For example, can we go the Polish way?

[Kuznetsova] Do you mean the method of "shock therapy?" We cannot, primarily, because the government does not have this credit of confidence in our country. A lot has already been said about it...

[Titma] Of course, we cannot do it for this reason, but also for another reason—because we do not have politicians and political culture which would make it possible for them to coordinate mutual interests and formulate them into the political will of the people. This calls for exactly politicians rather than economists and sociologists, politicians of the kind of Lauristin here or Primakov in Moscow; that is, flexible people who can develop compromises...

[Kuznetsova] Are you convinced that they know how to work out such compromises here? So far, recent events in the republic have shown the opposite. What is your assessment of the situation in light of the changes which we have discussed?

[Titma] It is absolutely clear that the people do not want to live as before. However, it is unclear to them *how* to begin living differently. They cannot really apply themselves and find a way out. You know, I think that by now real perestroika has advanced the most in rural areas. There, the people have begun to take farmsteads on a massive scale. This year, this process has advanced very rapidly in Estonia. It is important that the farmsteads are being taken by specialists—agronomists and animal husbandry specialists—who know the business. Once again, this promises certain results.

Apparently, the sphere of consumer services will be next—small-scale trade and services. Privatization is beginning there. In this sphere, we may do everything, literally everything, without Moscow, without the center. Third, there are small enterprises looking for a niche to make money. The fourth stage is more complicated than that... This means urban manufacturing which produces for our domestic market. What is to be done about it? Finally, the most serious part—large enterprises which will have to find customers abroad. In this sphere, we should have more people like Chetvergov in Narva or Treyer at the Talleks. Alas... they are few.

[Kuznetsova] Are you discussing these processes as a sociologist, as a Supreme Soviet deputy who determines in this manner what the strategy of the Supreme Soviet and the government of the republic should be?

[Titma] I would say that my sociological expertise definitely plays a role in this. As a sociologist, I can just see which social communities may start out and in what kind of sequence. Of course, this gets used in some manner. However, I have no excessive personal ambitions and no desire to definitely head something.

In principle, the danger which was present two years ago has now passed. I am talking about the danger of the frustration of perestroika and a turn in the wrong direction, and about Estonia failing to secure independence. Both these problems are virtually no more. This will happen, sooner or later, with greater or smaller losses.

In the greater scheme of things, two other issues which may and should be substantially affected bother me. The first one is to prevent politics from getting harsher. I mean once again the onset of anticommunism. After all, many people who are now expressing their dissatisfaction, pain, and disappointment do not at all attribute them to what is proper. The danger of this was also very real in our republic, in Estonia. However, the fact that we retired from the arena at the right time (I mean the CPSU Central Committee in its previous condition) and gave a multiparty system an opportunity to develop has generally eliminated this danger.

[Kuznetsova] Well, it is hard to agree with you concerning the departure of the Communist Party. Will the weakening of the Communist Party, to say nothing of its withdrawal from the political arena, not bring about the strengthening of right-wing forces and many other serious consequences? Ultimately, the People's Front will "shift." However, this is another serious topic... As far as the danger of anticommunism in Estonia...

[Titma] ...it has begun to surface again in the opposition of the People's Front and the Congress. The issue of a new currency is the second danger. I see in this an element of a political play. Many people do not understand how serious it is. However, this currency is the foundation of a healthy economy. You have to have some valuables in order to have this currency. If we squander the valuables there will be no currency either.

[Kuznetsova] Do you see other dangers?

[Titma] Well, at present I do not consider dangerous what they refer to usually—the opposition of the Estonian and Russian communities. Take, for example, 15 May... About 3,000 people came to Toompea. Meanwhile, a year ago there were between 45,000 and 50,000 at a rally in front of City Hall. Hence my conclusion that the Russian community has mainly understood: What has been done in Estonia is not some kind of primitive nationalism. After all, essentially the same processes are underway in Russia at present, but with a delay... So, the Russian community has calmed down.

[Kuznetsova] Do you think it has?

[Titma] I believe that the people see now that the main thesis of the Intermovement and the OSTK [United Council of Labor Collectives] "we are in danger," perhaps, does not have all that firm a foundation.

[Kuznetsova] Once, I read this in the writings of Saltykov-Shchedrin: "There is no worse alarm than the alarm of apathy despite the expressions 'alarm' and 'apathy' appearing to be incompatible at first sight. If you are looking at a lazy and sluggish person, do not think that this sluggishness is tantamount to the absence of concerns. It is exactly inside this individual that alarm nests. He is concerned all the time about what he has not done, and about what he has yet to do..." Don't you think there is an analogy there? Alarm remains concerning the creation of "Kodukaitse" and its merger with "Kaitseliit" (they say for a reason that totalitarianism under the red flag may be replaced with totalitarianism under the blue-black-and-white flag), and the draft law on citizenship...

[Titma] I believe that at present a social base for some major social disturbances in the Russian community is absent. It will appear in Estonia when the market and food situation deteriorates still further. At that time, all of these issues will become weighty. It will be possible to exploit them politically. For now, the Russian community is not in such a condition that this could be played

on. To be sure, everything you have mentioned annoys and causes a negative response...

The feeling of uncertainty is there, and it is getting stronger. However, somewhat different conditions are necessary for the moment to come when the entire community takes to the streets and begins to act. It will come when the people begin to be oppressed by the actual living conditions. I understand that many people in the Russian-speaking population have lost faith in political forces inside the Estonian community. At the same time, I think that a majority does not agree to follow Russian fundamentalists of, say, the kind of Lysenko. However, in the Estonian community as well a sober attitude is setting in. Even the congress of Estonia is saying that the nonindigenous population needs to be given some guarantees... The government understands this. That is to say, objective realities are beginning to be perceived.

[Kuznetsova] In general, however, political passions are inflamed to such a degree that even constructive criticism is received badly at present. We also see this in the Supreme Soviet. Criticism is not perceived as something useful and needed for the cause, but rather as coming out AGAINST someone... Definitely against... Incidentally, I have heard that some members of the government resented your criticism of the program. Is it so?

[Titma] Perhaps so. So far, they have failed to understand one important point here. An opportunity for extensive criticism and self-criticism should exist in a society if it is to progress and develop. The role of the opposition in the parliament is exactly to offer alternative points of view while criticizing the government. It may adopt them or reject them. Independent democrats could even raise the issue of no-confidence in the government. This should be possible. However, we behaved and behave as constructive opposition, without raising the issue of power. We do not intend to hamper the activities of the government in any way.

[Kuznetsova] However, if there is not going to be the freedom of criticism why have the Supreme Soviet at all? In this case, it would suffice to hold a meeting which expresses approval, as was the case in the past...

[Titma] I believe that the people are, after all, becoming mature. In essence, the leaders of the People's Front are only settling into their role as the government. It is another level. After all, this is not the government of the People's Front. Indeed, it is formed by the People's Front, but it is the government of the republic of Estonia, and it should represent the interests of its entire population.

[Kuznetsova] Well, let us wish the government success in this role, and wish you to be constructive and bold in the opposition.

RSFSR

Yeltsin Opens 3 Jul Supreme Soviet Session

*LD0307082190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
0630 GMT 3 Jul 90*

[Report by correspondent Olga Vasilenko from the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR, House of Soviets in Moscow]

[Excerpt] The Russian Supreme Soviet will start work at 0930 [0530 GMT] and not 1000. So we will have our morning meeting on the air before the sessions opens, most likely half an hour earlier, and not at 0940-0950 as people are accustomed.

And now about the last half an hour. The session was opened by Boris Nikolyaevich Yeltsin. The registration showed that both chambers have a quorum. They decided that a full relay of the session is not necessary. Reports will suffice, and that concerns, in the first place, television, and, of course, us as well.

Now the deputies have begun to form committees. I will finish my report here on the work of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet session.

RSFSR Supreme Soviet To 'Last Until 12 Jul'

LD0307065190

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 0550 GMT on 3 July broadcasts a 3-minute report by correspondent Vladimir Koroblev from the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic (RSFSR) House of Soviets, where he says that "the sitting of the parliament of Russia begins in 10 minutes' time [0600 GMT]."

He then goes on to discuss the agenda, noting that "it is proposed that the work of the session last until 12 July." Koroblev remarks that the deputies are "to elect committees of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation" and "hear the report of the chairman of the Council of Ministers of the RSFSR on the structure and composition of the government, and also form the cabinet of the Council of Ministers of the Russian Federation."

Koroblev then interviews a member of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation on the view of his electorate of the results of the work of the first congress of RSFSR people's deputies. On the whole, they are satisfied with it, the parliamentarian says.

RSFSR 'Decree on Power' Published

*90UN2251A Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY
in Russian No 25, 23-29 Jun 90 p 1*

["Decree on Power"—"text accepted as a basis (za osnovu) at the First RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies"]

Text] The First RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Congress of People's Deputies

declares by this decree that all power in the RSFSR belongs exclusively to the people.

State power in the RSFSR is exercised by the people directly or through representative organs of power at the center and in the localities. The most important task of all organs of state power and government without exception is to serve the people and safeguard the rights, freedoms, and legitimate interests of citizens with all means at their disposal.

Any illegal interference by political parties, party-political organs, or other social organizations in the activity of the organs of state power and government, the economic or sociocultural activity of state enterprises, institutions, or organizations must be terminated at once with all decisiveness.

The following are not permitted in the RSFSR:

- combining the jobs of leaders of organs of state power and government with any other job in state organizations, political parties, or social organizations;
- the system of party-political leadership in state enterprises, institutions, organizations, law enforcement organs, the KGB, the Armed Forces, and other militarized formations;
- the belonging of judges and other functionaries of state law enforcement organs to political parties or sociopolitical movements;
- the financing of any political or sociopolitical organizations or movements from state sources.

The Constitution Commission is directed to introduce for examination of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies amendments to the RSFSR Constitution related to adoption of the Decree on Power.

RSFSR Supreme Soviet Committees Formed

*90UN2196C Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 21 Jun 90 Single Edition p 1*

[RSFSR Supreme Soviet Decree on Committees of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet]

[Text] The RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet resolves:

1. To form the following RSFSR Supreme Soviet committees:

the Legislative Committee;

the Economic Reform and Property Committee;

the Interrepublic Relations, Regional Policy, and Cooperation Committee;

the Committee for the Work of the Soviets of People's Deputies and the Development of Self-Government;

the Industry and Power Engineering Committee;

the Social Development of the Countryside, Agrarian Issues, and Food Committee;

the Construction, Architecture, and Housing and Municipal Services Committee;

the Science and Public Education Committee;

the Health Care, Social Security, and Physical Culture Committee;

the Committee for Invalids, War and Labor Veterans, and Social Protection of Servicemen and Their Families;

the Committee for Women, and Protection of the Family and Mother and Child;

the Youth Affairs Committee;

the Ecology and Rational Use of Natural Resources Committee;

the International Affairs and Foreign Economic Relations Committee;

the Legality, Law and Order, and the Fight Against Crime Committee;

the Committee for the Mass Media, Relations With Public Organizations and Mass Citizens Movements, and Study of Public Opinion;

the Committee for Freedom of Worship, Religion, Philanthropy, and Charity.

2. To extend to the RSFSR Supreme Soviet committees prior to the adoption of a legal enactment regulating the committees' activity the Regulations Governing Standing Commissions of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet in respect of the basic principles and procedure of work and their rights and duties.

Resolution on Nuclear Waste State Program Viewed

PM0207133190 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 28 Jun 90 Second Edition p 1

[“Congress of RSFSR People’s Deputies Resolution on Elaborating a State Program on Radioactive Waste and Spent Nuclear Materials, Their Utilization, Their Burial, and Urgent Measures To Improve the Radioactive Environmental Situation on RSFSR Territory”—SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA headline]

[Text] Bearing in mind the increasing volume of radioactive waste formed and stockpiled on RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] territory as a result of the operation and decommissioning of obsolete atomic facilities and nuclear installations belonging to the USSR Ministry of Nuclear Power Generation and the Nuclear Industry, the USSR Ministry of the Maritime Fleet, and the USSR Defense Ministry, and also the low technical standard of the departmental approach toward resolving the problem of collecting, processing, and eliminating radioactive waste and the dissipation of resources allocated to this end, which has created an

unhealthy environmental and sociopsychological situation in a number of RSFSR regions, the Congress of RSFSR People’s Deputies resolves:

1. To deem the problem of dealing with radioactive waste and its utilization and burial to be a task of particular state significance.

2. The RSFSR Supreme Soviet is to submit a proposal to the USSR Supreme Soviet to instruct the USSR Council of Ministers to elaborate before June 1991 and submit for ratification to the USSR Supreme Soviet a state program for dealing with radioactive waste and spent nuclear materials and their utilization and burial in the USSR, stipulating the time frame and people responsible for implementing the program.

3. It is advisable to link the program in question with the discussion and adoption in the USSR Supreme Soviet of a Law “On the Use of Atomic Power and Nuclear Safety in the USSR.”

4. The RSFSR Council of Ministers, together with the USSR State Committee for Environmental Protection and the USSR State Committee for the Supervision of Safe Working Practices in Industry and the Atomic Power Industry, is to implement concrete measures relating to RSFSR environment protection interests, for inclusion in the state program.

5. The RSFSR Council of Ministers is instructed to carry out an audit of all installations on RSFSR territory for the long-term storage and burial of radioactive waste and spent nuclear materials and to prepare recommendations on their siting and the procedure for their operation on RSFSR territory.

6. Pending the adoption of the program, the start of the construction of new nuclear power industry facilities on RSFSR territory is deemed inadmissible as from 1 January 1991.

7. The RSFSR Council of Ministers is instructed to prepare proposals to prohibit the burial on RSFSR territory of end products of nuclear facilities’ activity from other republics and countries as of 1 January 1991.

[Dated] The Kremlin, Moscow, 22 June 1990.

Resolution on Election of Soviet of Republic

PM2506092990 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 21 Jun 90 Single Edition p 1

[“Congress of RSFSR People’s Deputies Resolution on Election of RSFSR Supreme Soviet of the Republic Members”—SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA headline]

[Text] The Congress of RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] People’s Deputies resolves:

1. That the results of the voting in the elections to the RSFSR Supreme Soviet of the Republic be approved.

2. That the following RSFSR people's deputies be deemed elected to the RSFSR Supreme Soviet of the Republic:

Yuriy Mikhaylovich Voronin, deputy chairman of the Tatar ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers and chairman of the Tatar ASSR State Planning Committee;

Alvin Yevstafyevich Yermila, chairman of the Kostroma Oblast Soviet Executive Committee;

Yuriy Vladimirovich Zaytsev, rector of the All-Union Correspondence Polytechnical Institute, Moscow;

Aleksey Andreyevich Zlobin, priest in charge of the Church of the Birth of Our Lady, Konakovskiy Rayon, Kalinin Oblast;

Mikhail Dmitriyevich Maley, director of the "Informelektro" All-Union Scientific Research Institute, Moscow;

Sergey Vadimovich Stepashin, lieutenant colonel and instructor at the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs Higher Political School, Leningrad;

Vasily Nikolayevich Travnikov, chief of the Frunzenskiy Rayon Soviet Executive Committee Internal Affairs Administration, Leningrad;

Anton Yuryevich Fedorov, first secretary of the Krasnoglinskiy Communist Youth League Rayon Committee, Kuybyshev;

Yuriy Illarionovich Shikharev, cutting machinery operator at the mine named for Shevyakov, Mezhdurechensk, Kemerovo Oblast.

First Secretary Polozkov Tours Bryansk Oblast

PM0107133190 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 30 Jun 90 Single Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Meetings on Bryansk Soil"]

[Text] The results of the first phase of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party Constituent Congress and the tasks of completing the preparations for the 28th CPSU Congress and the holding of stage two of the Russian communists' forum were at the center of attention at the meetings and talks held 27-28 June between I.K. Polozkov, first secretary of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee, and the communists and residents of Bryansk and Bryansk Oblast.

The first secretary visited the "Bryanskiy Mashinostroitelnyy Zavod" Production Association, whose party organization numbers more than 3,600 communists. The Bryansk machine builders who took part in the conversations supported the creation of the Russian Communist Party and expressed the hope that it will win prestige in society through action rather than through declarations, become a nucleus uniting the people's creative

forces, and act energetically for the sake of the fundamental interests of Russia's working people, showing constant concern for the socialist fatherland's present and future.

The communist workers drew attention to the need to ensure that the Russian Communist Party should consistently and purposefully uphold at the 28th congress the ideas of consolidating the CPSU's healthy forces on a platform of democratization and perestroika.

Answering questions, I.K. Polozkov stressed in particular that, under the conditions of the rapid politicization of society, communists' party organizations must eradicate the command approach, change party members' mentalities, and influence all groups and strata of society with the only acceptable method—the method of convincing people of the correctness of the policy which the RSFSR Communist Party is planning to implement.

The first secretary stated that the Central Committee will organize its work on the basis of primary party organizations and heeding the opinion of the working class, peasantry, intelligentsia, and all those who are sincerely concerned about Russia's fate.

I.K. Polozkov visited the ecological disaster zone caused by the Chernobyl AES catastrophe. In the most radiation-polluted villages of Krasnogorskiy Rayon he met with residents who should be resettled this year to clean territories. He also visited the villages of Letoshniki and Nikolskaya Sloboda, which are being built to accommodate those being resettled. In conversation with the residents of the village of Zaborye he assured them that the Russians who were affected by the disaster are entitled to and can count on the closest attention to their needs from the RSFSR Communist Party. Through Russian communists working in the republic's Supreme Soviet and its government we will try to pursue a policy of exhaustive measures to help the affected areas, he said.

In Bryansk I.K. Polozkov met with the city's party aktiv, visited the "Partizanskaya Polyana"—which is sacred to everyone from Bryansk—and the country-house museum of the great Russian poet F.I. Tyutchev in Ovsug Village, and laid a wreath at the V.I. Lenin Monument in Bryansk.

Resolution Seen on "Mechanism of Sovereignty"

PM2206135390 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 22 Jun 90 Single Edition p 1

[Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies resolution "On the Mechanism of Sovereignty in the RSFSR"]

[Text] In accordance with the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Constitution and the Declaration on Sovereignty the people hold all power in the RSFSR. The people exercise state power by means of the soviets of people's deputies and also in direct democratic forms.

The RSFSR guarantees citizens' equality irrespective of their origins, social and property position, racial and national affiliation, sex, education, language, the nature of their work, place of residence, attitude to religion, political and other convictions, and membership of parties or other legal public organizations.

With a view to perfecting the mechanism of sovereignty and guaranteeing citizens' quality the Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies resolves that:

1. State power in the RSFSR is exercised by the people directly or via representative organs of power in the center and at local level. The main tasks of organs of state power and management is to serve the people and safeguard citizens' rights, freedoms, and legitimate interests.

2. It is not permitted in the RSFSR for the leader of a state organ of power or management to combine any post with another, including posts within political or sociopolitical organizations.

3. The RSFSR Supreme Soviet and the Constitutional Commission are to be instructed to finalize the draft Decree on Power, which was adopted as a base, with consideration for the comments and proposals made by RSFSR people's deputies and submit it for examination by the Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies.

Trade Minister Kurenkov on Market Development

PM1906131990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
14 Jun 90 Second Edition p 4

[Interview with P.I. Kurenkov, RSFSR minister of trade, by correspondent Ye. Sorokin under the "Topical Interview" rubric: "The Market and Trade"—place and date not specified—first two paragraphs are editorial introduction]

[Text] The past few months, which have been marked by a frantic demand for goods, have highlighted problems in the economy and in trade itself. This sphere, which is at the center of public opinion, mirrors all the ailments of industrial and agricultural production.

Your PRAVDA correspondent now talks with RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Trade Minister P.I. Kurenkov about the problems facing trade and ways to overcome the crisis in it.

[Sorokin] Petr Ivanovich! There is a saying that what is bad for Russia is bad for the whole country. That things are bad for Russian trade right now we know, sadly, not from hearsay. What would you, as a professional in this field, give as the reasons for the sector's very sorry state?

[Kurenkov] Indeed, a host of problems have built up. But, according to the figures, the sector is actually developing. In 1989, for example, disposable incomes were R9.5 billion. A program to eliminate loss-making enterprises is being carried out—there are just nine now.

But the 15-percent increase in commodity turnover, ostensibly a positive factor, has effectively paralyzed trade as a commercial sphere. The scarcity of goods and the accompanying uproar are forcing local soviets to introduce restrictions: daytime-only sales [dnevnyaya prodazha], "sales to customers in person only" ["otpusk v odni ruki"], and coupons. The main aim of this is to protect the interests of customers, primarily the disabled, veterans, and large families. We have had to resort to that in conjunction with local soviets. It wasn't a matter of choice, of course. The ministry's principled position is that there should be "free trade." For example, we categorically oppose trade on the basis of passports. However, local soviets have the final say here.

[Sorokin] In your view, then, why are the stores becoming empty? What measures has the Russian government taken to repair the market?

[Kurenkov] It would be no great revelation on my part if I were to say that the main reason is the rapid growth in the population's money incomes, which is outstripping the rate of production of goods. For example, in the first quarter of 1990 incomes showed an increase of 13 percent whereas production of goods rose by only 7.6 percent [?compared with 1989].

In recent years the government has taken quite a few decisions to increase the production of goods. However, not one has been fulfilled. The right granted to enterprises to independently establish production plans is often used for group and narrow departmental interests. For instance, enterprises have adopted a 1990 production plan totaling just R216 billion, or R19 billion less than the R235 billion target (excluding alcoholic beverages) approved by the RSFSR Supreme Soviet. Enterprises raise their prices, and production falls.

Here are just a few examples. The production of men's worsted suits in 1990 is to increase by 20 percent in terms of retail prices compared with 1988. But in physical terms that is a 6-percent reduction. It is the same with many other types of goods—women's overcoats, men's winter boots, and so forth. And don't forget the reduction in imports.

Some time ago the Ministry of Trade informed the CPSU Central Committee, the RSFSR government, and the USSR State Planning Committee about the state of affairs and made specific suggestions about what needed to be done to prevent the impoverishment of the commodity market.

An analysis suggests that the volume of production of goods must be increased to R334 billion by 1995—an increase of over 40 percent (in 1990 prices). Meanwhile, the production of foodstuffs is to rise by 20 percent, production in the light industry is to rise by 50 percent, and the production of cultural, consumer, and technical goods is to rise by 30 percent.

Professional economists, including Soviet economists, cite the following measures as priorities: The conversion

of the defense industry must be carried out immediately; there must be a special program to retrain at least one-third of the entire defense complex for this purpose, starting right away in 1990-1991, what's more; investments in all production sectors must be frozen for 2 years and facilities which are more than 50-percent ready must be switched to the production of goods; increased consumer goods production must be encouraged by means of incentives, so that the higher the growth rate (in physical terms), the lower the tax; all taxation of agricultural producers must be suspended for five years; and measures of an economic character must be introduced to attract foreign capital on a wide scale to increase consumer goods production.

[Sorokin] But is the trade network ready to sell such a large quantity of goods, will the waiting lines not become even longer?

[Kurenkov] I am confident that this task is feasible but only with the corresponding material and technical base. The failure of the union ministries of the radio industry and the shipbuilding industry to supply vast quantities of equipment to us means that we must organize production by our own efforts.

In part people criticize us for the poor development of the self-service network. That is the reason for the waiting lines, they say. But the trade system is by no means wholly to blame here—there is a shortage of prepacked goods.

Generally speaking we should have switched to the production of prepacked and individually wrapped goods using bar-coded packaging a long time ago. We also suggested developing that system once upon a time—no one listened to us. But the entire civilized world trades that way.

[Sorokin] Our economy is now switching to market conditions. I think that trade should lead the way to the market. It is ready for that?

[Kurenkov] The mechanism existing in trade until now was incapable of resolving its problems. In the first place, it did not give enterprises sufficient freedom. In the second, even if it had managed to create an ideal mechanism for that it simply wouldn't have worked, given the relations that exist with other sectors of the national economy at present. Switching trade alone to market relations is utopian.

But the first steps have already been taken. A mechanism for transferring the sector to market conditions and a rapid training program for cadres using the ministry's specialists have been developed. The work of the wholesale sector is now being restructured. The RSFSR Ministry of Trade commercial bank begins operating this year. The "Torgtekhnik" production association is being set up. In a number of spheres trading organizations have switched to joint stock ownership. But it needs a decision of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet to free our hands. In the sector 8,703 trade and production units

have now switched to leasing (234,400 people). The law on ownership also makes it possible to further develop these and other forms of economic management.

In the future a large proportion of medium and small stores will be sold to families, individuals, and collectives. On the basis of existing practice, around 48 percent of stores could be switched to those forms of ownership. Snack bars, pelmeni stands, cafes, shashlik kiosks, and restaurants seating up to 100 people will be go into individual ownership.

The existence of enterprises under various forms of ownership will also lead to their amalgamation (into associations, concerns, and consortiums), purely on a voluntary basis. As these structures develop, present-day trade organizations and trusts will be abolished.

[Sorokin] Will the ministry itself not disappear?

[Kurenkov] I do not think so. But its role and functions will change radically. The Ministry of Trade will regulate the general principles of trade development and will also collaborate with Union organs and other republics. It will draw up the programs for the long-term development of the sector and elaborate the basic rules of trade, the bases of the price formation mechanism, and the principles governing the managerial, financial-economic, and legal activity of trade enterprises and associations.

RSFSR Economic Sovereignty Plan Proposed

904.104124 Moscow *EKONOMIKA I ZHIZN*
in Russian No 23, Jun 90 pp 14-15

[Proposals prepared by group of scientists of the USSR Academy of Sciences Economics Institute: "Socioeconomic Foundations of the Sovereignty of the Russian Federation Under the Conditions of Transition to a Controlled Market"]

[Text] *EKONOMIKA I ZHIZN* No. 21 published a draft concept of the economic sovereignty of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] drawn up by the republic government. Today we publish proposals prepared by a group of scientists of the USSR Academy of Sciences Economics Institute. They contain the authors' basic initial propositions: the need for a staged transition to a controlled market; renunciation of an automatic share-out and gratis "distribution" of property; a consistent policy of the molding of collective forms of ownership; a strengthening of the sovereignty of the RSFSR based on a combination of the authority of the republic and local organs of administration, given the full independence of the producers; and reform of the national-state arrangement of the republic. The main goal of a strengthening of the sovereignty of the RSFSR is the sovereignty of its peoples and the defense of its interests through the formation of a diversified modern economy.

The authors of the proposals do not share the position leading to an absolutization of the "sovereignty" category

with reference to a republic which is a part of the USSR. Sovereignty is always historical and functional. The republic's sovereignty today is objectively limited by the fact of its incorporation in the Union and by the interpublic and interregional economic relations that have taken shape.

The proposals were drawn up by candidates of economic sciences S. Valentev, Ye. Bukhvald, A. Vilenskiy, O. Yezhova, N. Kolyadina, and A. Odintsova, and also A. Vladimirov, S. Grigoryev, O. Gladilina, and G. Shlizhyus.

1. Basic Directions of a Strengthening of the Sovereignty of the Russian Federation

The sovereignty of the RSFSR is inseparably connected with the level of its economic independence which enables it itself to control the rate and proportions of social development and determine the forms of combination of the planned and market principles in its economy and also the place of the latter in the intra-Union and international division of labor. An inalienable part of the sovereignty of the RSFSR is its right to independently delimit the authority of the republic organs of administration and the organs of administration of the autonomous republics and local self-government and also determine the list of functions which the republic deems it necessary to delegate to the USSR.

The first condition of the actual sovereignty of the republic is a complete break with the administrative-command system by transition to a controlled market based on the full economic independence of the producers. It is necessary also to differentiate between the market economy and the economy of transition to the market. These types of economies are qualitatively different, which cannot fail to influence the mechanism of the formation of the sovereignty of the republic and the USSR and the methods of its realization.

A strengthening of the sovereignty of the RSFSR is connected with the accomplishment of cardinal economic reform geared to the staged formation of Union and republic controlled markets. Their creation presupposes the assurance by economic legislation of the equality of different forms of ownership (private included); the real independence and responsibility of the producers; the molding of an autonomous financial and budget system; and reform of the credit and banking system.

A second condition of the sovereignty of the republic is a change in the "ideology" and mechanisms of state administration given the most active development and expansion of the functions of local self-government.

For the purpose of decentralization of state administration it is essential to strengthen regional economic centers and hand over to them material and financial resources in accordance with their new authority.

The decentralization of administration presupposes the right of the organs of state administration and self-government of the autonomous jurisdictions and the regions to regulate economic processes independently. They should be fully responsible for the decisions that are made.

It is objectively necessary to shape a mechanism providing for protection of the interests and sovereign rights of the RSFSR. It is necessary today even to recognize the RSFSR as having no fewer rights than those possessed by other Union republics. Otherwise there is a great probability of the brunt of the material and financial outlays of the transitional period being shifted onto the RSFSR; the practice whereby its resources are utilized for the concealed preferential financing of other republics would persist.

A strengthening of the sovereignty of the republic requires cardinal reform of the republic's national-state arrangement.

2. Renewal of the Soviet Federation and the Sovereignty of the RSFSR

A serious obstacle to a strengthening of the sovereignty of the RSFSR is the unregulated state of its relations with the USSR and the other Union republics. Solution of the problem will depend on the nature and content of the renewed Soviet Federation.

Protection of the sovereign rights of the RSFSR should be built on the basis of the republic's delegation to the USSR only of that authority in the sphere of economic and social regulation for which centralization at the Union level is in keeping with its own interests.

It is essential also to shape conditions whereby the laws of the market begin to determine the economic interaction between the republics and within them. It is necessary for this to ensure the equality and independence of all managing subjects and exclude attempts by the republic organs of administration to automatically "confine" enterprises merely to the interrepublic market. The immediate formation of a controlled market is impossible. This is prevented by the current mechanism of movement of the aggregate social product served chiefly by vertical management structures terminating at the Union economic center level; and the absence of a market mechanism of interrepublic exchange.

In this situation any appreciable disruption of the interrepublic national economic proportions which have taken shape would lead to economic chaos. For this reason the creation of an all-Union market should be preceded by temporary continuation of the republics' responsibility for compliance with interrepublic supply commitments.

At the transitional (first) stage of the creation of a market mechanism the center of gravity in the solution of socioeconomic questions proper will lie partly with the

republic. It will acquire independence in choice of priorities of socioeconomic development and economic management models.

The Union economic center will finance all-Union programs, monitor the movement of interrepublic commodity-money flows, and impose economic penalties on republics violating interrepublic business contracts. It is also reserved the function of maintaining all-Union guarantees of the minimum assurance of social benefits, employment, and so forth. It is proposed to create a special fund for this purpose in the Union budget.

At the second stage only the functions of general economic regulation through the financing and realization of all-Union programs will be retained by the center. The Union and republic budgets will be formed predominantly on the actual autonomous tax base.

The formation of a qualitatively new system of socioeconomic relations between the Union republics and the USSR should be completed at the third stage under the impact of market relations. The republics' autonomous financial systems will have taken shape conclusively.

A principal condition of the shaping of the Union and republic markets is the problem of the free movement of manpower. It is necessary first of all to resolve the economic problems of ensuring its free relocation and also guarantees of the rights of citizens temporarily or permanently resident outside of the republics and national-territorial formations. It is necessary to provide for a mechanism of protection of their political and economic interests, a system of compensation for refugees and, what is most important, sources of the financing of these sums of compensation.

3. National-State Arrangement of the RSFSR

The need for the reorganization of the national-state arrangement of the RSFSR is brought about by the fact that today the federal character is essentially a fiction, and the principles of the composition of interethnic relations in the republic do not provide for the normal solution of contradictions which emerge. This is complicating economic transformations in the RSFSR.

What is required is a transformation of the national-state and economic arrangement of the republic on the principles of real federation; the formation of bodies guaranteeing the protection of the sovereignty of the RSFSR in the USSR; and a strengthening of the competent authority of the republic in the organization of economic life on its territory compensating for the weakening of the controlling functions of the Union economic center.

At the transitional stage it is advisable to take the path of compromise: preserving the current administrative-territorial arrangement of the republic, to ensure the equality of economic rights of the autonomous soviet socialist republics [ASSR], krais, and oblasts, and also accord all compact-resident nations and nationalities the right to form national-cultural okrugs as the basis of

reorganization of the system of interethnic relations. Such okrugs would represent and defend the interests of the corresponding people before the superior organs of territorial administration and the republic government. Regardless of the strength of the population and the territory occupied, the national-cultural okrugs should have identical legal status on a strictly defined list of issues and also an economic base making it possible to realize these tasks.

At the subsequent stage it will be necessary to ensure universality of the principle of autonomy in the national-state arrangement of the RSFSR without any ranking of the autonomous jurisdictions by "kind." It will be necessary to distinguish the socioeconomic and national-territorial integral entities which could acquire the status of ASSR and also to "pull up" to ASSR level the autonomous jurisdictions that currently exist.

The development of genuinely federative principles in the national-state arrangement of the RSFSR demands a new approach to the problem of representation of the nations and nationalities of the republic in its highest bodies, which should be built on the principles of the representation of each autonomous jurisdiction and each national-cultural okrug and republic associations of persons of a particular nationality residing in the RSFSR, but lacking compact settlement; and the dependence of representation on the national structure in the autonomous jurisdictions.

4. Centralism and Self-Government

The renewal of the RSFSR requires the development of a system of the people's self-government. All public organizations, associations, and other public institutions should be given the right to exist, unless their activity is connected with infringement of the rights of the citizens. The shaping of self-government is a lengthy process.

The RSFSR lacks as yet sufficient economic and political conditions for ensuring a balance between the state authorities and self-government. The danger of a strengthening of administrative-command principles in management or an unbalancing of the economy and the system of political relations persists. It is essential to ensure a change in the nature of centralism with regard for the particular features of the transitional period and given preservation of strong state authority in the republic. This presupposes a redistribution of legislative and executive authority pertaining to the regulation of socioeconomic processes among the republics, the autonomous jurisdictions, and the regions; and reservation for the republic organs of administration and the organs of state administration of the ASSR, krais, and oblasts of functions pertaining to the regulation of the economy in accordance with the reproduction assignments being realized at each territorial level. A gradual transition from the practice of directive management to republic and regional programs financed from the revenue of the corresponding budgets is necessary.

Thus in the transitional period it is proposed realizing self-government mainly by way of the population's participation in the activity of local soviets independent in their formation and fulfillment of local budgets, use of the property facilities at their disposal, control of the regional market, and development of the local economy.

At subsequent stages there will be an objective weakening of the functions of the middle (kray, oblast) component, primarily when it comes to a solution of social problems. The strengthening of the material and financial base of the local soviets and their acquisition of the necessary experience will make it possible to gradually shift responsibility for satisfaction of the population's social requirements onto the rayon and city local soviets.

We should attribute primarily to the functions of the local organs of administration the development of health care and education; and the construction and management of facilities of the social infrastructure, housing, and environmental protection.

The most important tasks of the soviets and their authorities also include assurance of the population's socially guaranteed minimum living standard with regard for regional specifics. It should not depend on the degree of development of the local economy and the amount of state revenue accumulated on the territory.

A most important task of the local soviets is the formation of the conditions for the stimulation of all types of entrepreneurial activity. The impermissibility of the soviets' interference in the day-to-day activity of the economic organizations (local economy included), relations with which it is proposed building on a contractual basis, should be enshrined in legislation.

Administrative rayons and cities of oblast jurisdiction, which the concept also sees as the source components of the formation of the economic and political instruments of local self-government, are the base component of state administration of the social sphere in RSFSR. It is here that the bulk of the population's requirements is satisfied, as a rule, and that there is a sufficient production and construction base for ensuring a territory's comprehensive development. Only at this level (and below) is the population's direct supervision of the organs of territorial administration possible.

5. Ownership Relations

The evolutionary transformation of ownership relations by way of their gradual adaptation to the model of a multistructural, market economy is essential.

The change in the republic's national-state arrangement will influence the development of ownership relations in the RSFSR. However, the automatic division of state property along national lines would be a mistake. This applies primarily to the land and its interior, which should remain in republic ownership.

It is proposed to accomplish the transformation of state ownership in two directions.

The first is connected with democratization of the organs of state power and administration at the center and locally, without which the economically and socially efficient use of state property of all levels is impossible. The change in the form and content of state ownership should proceed in parallel with the change and democratization of the nature of the state.

A particular place in the change in the forms and content of state ownership belongs to the development of a system of local self-government presupposing the formation of municipal ownership.

The second direction is connected with the formation of the economic and legal principles of the real attachment of objects of ownership to the corresponding subjects by the sale of some of the objects of state ownership, including their sale by auction. This will make it possible to limit the arbitrary redistribution of objects of ownership depending on a change in political and economic conditions.

Considering that the Union, republic, and regional administrative-departmental authorities lack sources for the financing of substantial numbers of economic facilities, the local soviets should be accorded the right of initiative for their sale, auction, or leasing.

For the purpose of avoiding chaos and abuses in the selling off or auctioning of state property it is proposed to create locally institutions of commissioners to administer it who would be fully responsible to the republic Council of Ministers. They would ensure the authenticity of the valuation and determine the conditions of the sale of state property and become the holders of the block of shares belonging to the state if the sale is effected by way of auction. The income obtained from the sale of state property would go to pay off the national debt of the USSR in the proportion pertaining to the republic.

The process of the creation of stock companies could be used to change the structure of budget expenditure in the republic. The circulation of securities and an acceleration of their dissemination will require the organization of specialized credit institutions, through which securities would be emitted and circulated. At the first stage of the establishment of the credit system the servicing of the circulation of securities could be entrusted on a voluntary basis to the banks.

6. The RSFSR Budget Under the Conditions of the Republic's Economic Independence

The accomplishment of the tasks confronting the Russian Federation presupposes a fund of budget resources and the creation within the framework of the republic's financial and budget system of effective levers of indirect regulation of the structure of social production and the social sphere. Taxation and fiscal levers together with the

financing of republic programs of economic and social development should be the main instruments of the centralized regulation and stimulation of social production in the republic.

The RSFSR budget can only be strengthened due to the increased efficiency of its national economy and improvement of the system of taxation of the enterprises and the population. It requires a redistribution of state revenue among Union, republic, and local budgets in keeping with the problems being tackled at each level of state administration.

The real economic independence of the RSFSR requires the gradual formation of a fully autonomous financial, budget, and tax system of the republic.

Two versions of the relationship of the republic and Union budgets, which proceed from the need for the staged transition to the republic's independence and a market economy, are possible. The differences between them are connected also with possible models of reform of the Soviet Federation.

The first version corresponds to the initial conditions of transition to a market economy. It is proposed to preserve the autonomous system of Union ("federative") taxation. The principles of the composition of the tax system must change fundamentally. It is essential to abandon three principles of fiscal policy incompatible with the idea of the republic's economic independence and the formation of a market economy: the specific predetermination of enterprise payments into the budget depending on their departmental jurisdiction and other organizational-economic characteristics; division of individual types of budget revenue according to budgets of different levels; adjustment of the revenue of local budgets by superior financial authorities to amounts of expenditure determined in advance.

The second version of the relations between the Union and republic budgets corresponds to the stage of completion of the formation of the renewed Soviet Federation, when the functions of regulation of the decisive proportion of economic and social processes and influence on the development of the market have been transferred to the republics. The chief singularity of this version is that the Union budget will shed its ties, as it were, to the taxpayers and will be formed thanks to specific contributions from the Union republic budgets on a contractual basis. It is proposed to determine the amount of the contribution on the basis of the overall amount of social production in the republic (in terms of national income generated); and the comparative level of the republic's socioeconomic development in relation to the other republics and the USSR (in terms of per capita value of national income generated). This presupposes the introduction of special corrective coefficients to the first of the said factors; and determination of the extent and nature of the functions which the republic deems it possible to include on the list of powers of the Union organs of administration.

Assistance to the socioeconomically least developed Union republics according to the first and second models should be effected within the framework of a clearly designated special fund based on a combination of both gratis financing and the long-term extension of credit.

The following should be made the basis of the state budget of the RSFSR: an evaluation of the actual possibilities of the formation of centralized budget funds in the republic; a long-term evaluation of the need of the republic and its autonomous jurisdictions and the regions for financial and budget resources, including (according to the second version) resources necessary for contribution to the Union budget. Targets (facilities) financed from either the Union budget or part of the financially autonomous income of the enterprises or the population's income should be earmarked also.

The following principles of formation of the republic's budget system should be fundamental: complete independence of the lower from the superior budgets, and formation of the revenue side of the budgets of all levels on the basis of long-term stable rates and payment schedules; use of rates determined in the republic of the financing of the social sphere only as the minimum rates with the right for them to be exceeded given sufficient financial resources in the local soviets; and rate-setting for resources spent on the maintenance of the soviets of all levels and their apparatus.

Given either version, a progressive income tax on all types of enterprises and the employed population should constitute the basis of the republic's financial and budget system. Tax control will be performed by an independent tax inspectorate.

For the purpose of the efficient implementation of economic, social, environmental and other programs it is expedient to accord the republic organs of administration the right to differentiate tax rates and terms. It is essential also to determine accelerated depreciation rates for enterprises of the technically advanced sectors, and for all categories of enterprises tax allowances for investments, primarily in the modernization and reconstruction of production and the implementation of environmental protection measures.

Similar taxation systems should also be created at national-state autonomous jurisdiction level.

The renewal of the RSFSR on a genuinely democratic basis presupposes that the predominant place in the republic's financial and budget system will be occupied by the local budgets concentrating financial resources sufficient for the local soviet's exercise of the basic range of functions pertaining to the economic and social development of territory under its jurisdiction.

Being fully independent of the republic-wide financial system, local taxation should be oriented toward income from enterprises of the local economy, cooperative and individual-labor activity, and fees for resources and also taxation of property, local taxes, and other payments.

Republic laws at the transitional stage should determine the limits of local tax-writing in the form of a top rate of tax and charges of the local budget in relation to the national income generated in the region. Taxes and charges established in accordance with the results of a local referendum must not be canceled and limited by superior authorities.

7. Formation of the Credit System

It is essential that the republic have a relatively independent credit system capable of functioning under the conditions of a diversity of forms of ownership and satisfying the requirements of a controlled market economy and the preservation of a uniform monetary and credit system of the USSR based on the ruble with regard for the right of all the Union republics to exercise their own monetary and credit policy on their territory. It is anticipated making the basis of formation of the credit system of the USSR a banking system incorporating independent republic systems of banks united by the country's central bank (the USSR State Bank). The formation of a two-tier banking system, the basis of which would be a network of commercial banks terminating in a republic central bank (the National Bank), would be expedient in the RSFSR. Relations between the republic's banks would be organized "horizontally" on a contractual basis.

It is proposed forming a credit system ensuring the conditions for the multivariant nature of the accumulation of monetary resources and the investment of capital. Its creation within the framework of the transitional period would occupy several stages and would depend on the rate of radical economic reform and the nature and rate of transformations in the RSFSR national economy.

The first stage would see reform of the banking system and division and precise delineation of the functions of the republic central bank and the commercial banks; and the "commercialization" of the activity of the former special banks.

The success and tempo of the accomplishment of the tasks of the second stage would depend on the measures of the USSR Government pertaining to liberalization of monetary and credit policy. This presupposes reservation for the country's central bank of functions ensuring the unity of the monetary system. All other functions would be transferred to the republics' banks. It is essential to determine the mutual responsibility of the USSR State Bank and the Union republic central banks for the state of money turnover and the functions performed by the USSR State Bank.

The creation of an independent credit system of the RSFSR within the framework of the second stage of the reform presupposes the accomplishment of several consecutive tasks. The independence of the republic's banking system, noninterference of the RSFSR Government in the banks' day-to-day activity, and legislative enshrinement of the impermissibility of interference by the RSFSR Ministry of Finance in the banks' activity

must be assured. The elimination of state monopolism in banking and the creation and legal enshrinement of equal conditions for the development of banks representing different forms of ownership are essential. Republic banking legislation stipulating the status of the republic central bank, the mechanism of its interaction with the USSR State Bank, the principles of the functioning of the commercial and other banking institutions, and common rules of the organization of the circulation of securities on the territory of the republic should be adopted. And, finally, the formulation of a mechanism of redemption of banking institutions from the state is needed.

Currently the credit system of the RSFSR is dissolved in the country's credit system. For this reason a republic central bank (National Bank of Russia) may not be created as a result of conversion of the republic banks. The formation of a banking institution fundamentally new for the RSFSR is needed. It would be expedient to embark on the creation of a National Bank as a share company, subsequently converting it into a stock company. The founders could be the republic government, and the shareholders, republic organizations with their own resources.

8. Directions of Regulation of the Republic's Socioeconomic Development

The formation in the RSFSR of the foundations of a market economy presupposes transition from the system of directive planning and management to overall regulation of the economy. Targeted programs financed from the resources of the appropriate budget: all-Union, republic, and other programs should constitute the basis of economic regulation. The sum total of the programs (together with other methods of economic regulation) is the basis of the socioeconomic policy of the republic leadership.

The system of state regulation of social production in the republic should take account of such salient features as the extraordinary differentiation of individual regions in terms of the level of their socioeconomic development, the predominantly resource orientation of the economy of many regions, and the presence of a significant number of ecological disaster zones.

To influence market processes in the republic use will also be made of the sector of enterprises owned by the state under the direct management of its authorities; the tax system; financial policy; legislative provisions of economic conduct on the republic market, including this restriction or the other; and policy in the sphere of vocational education and personnel training and also in the sphere of the rational use of nature and environmental protection.

The system of state regulation in the Russian Federation should be geared to the solution of the following problems: stimulation of the development of progressive science-intensive sectors; stimulation of the development of small and medium-sized enterprises; assistance

to persons living below the poverty line, pensioners, and large families; ecological recovery throughout RSFSR territory both thanks to special environmental protection measures and to stimulation of the introduction of environmentally neutral technology and the relocation and reprofiling of individual works; and assurance of socioeconomic and national-cultural upturn of the most backward regions of the RSFSR.

Stankevich Describes Moscow Soviet Session

LD3006171690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1500 GMT 30 Jun 90

[Text] I would prefer less struggle and more work; this is how Sergey Stankevich, first deputy chairman of the Moscow City Soviet, [Mossovet] spoke of the nature of the discussions at the first session of the Mossovet of the new convocation. He summed up the preliminary results of the session—which should end within the next few days—at a press conference for Soviet and foreign journalists today.

In his opinion, the session is giving a precise social portrait of Moscow, with all of its social interests and groupings. But the political passions raging at it at times are not preventing the main point from being seen: The Soviet is efficient and constructive. Stankevich called the session's decision on handing over property and accommodation to Moscovites, together with other important acts strengthening their situation with regard to property, a legal breakthrough. Answering questions on the transition to the market, the deputy acknowledged that, of course, very little had yet been done, but the foundations for this had not been created in the country as a whole. The Mossovet, not waiting for the resolution of these issues in the higher echelons of power, has started to form market structures—to which the decisions at the session also bear witness.

In his introductory speech, the USSR people's deputy touched on the general political situation in the country. He noted that a near turning-point could be felt, which could for a long time ahead determine the path of the country's future development. There are two alternatives, he said. On one hand, orthodox-conservative forces in the country are becoming more active, and on the other, the growth of the democratic movement is continuing. Which road the country takes depends on the choice of the Soviet people.

Soviet 'Moscow' Deputies Appeal

90UN20024 Moscow VECHEPNIYAYA MOSKVA
in Russian 30 May 90 p 1

[“Appeal by ‘Moscow’ Deputies Group”]

[Text] Deputies of the “Moscow” group consider it necessary to make an appeal to the session and to Moscovites on the following urgent issue.

In view of the situation that has developed, there should be an additional review of the plan for conducting

workers' meetings that is contemplated for the near future. After approving the decisions concerning emergency measures to overcome the outburst of precipitant demand on the city's consumer market, the session once again returned to the unwarranted practice of parallel, detailed examination of diverse problems.

The effectiveness of the work has dropped even more. After a three week break in May, the second part of the session proved to be inadequately prepared. The consequence of this is that already nine work days of the second part of the session are not bringing about any tangible result.

The formation of the presidium of the Moscow Soviet of People's Deputies has not been completed. Consideration of the proposed report on paramount economic and social measures in the city has been replaced by an uncoordinated examination of separate questions. Although each of them is important in its own way, at the same time they cannot compensate for the departure from an integrated approach to the resolution of general city problems. The activity of the permanent commissions is being arranged slowly.

Efforts to work a little every day on the indicated three groups of questions, two to three hours each day, have already resulted now in a kind of “incompleteness,” a patchwork, and superficial consideration.

We must concentrate on the main point. Today, this means the situation in the city's trade, and the mood of the work collectives and electoral districts in connection with the extremely forceful measures regarding restrictions on the sale of food products and commodities. The measures justified themselves in the first days. But their consequences are ambiguous. While providing some benefits, they also give rise to new complicated problems.

We believe that it is intolerable to put off an analysis of these processes for the designated two weeks. We would like already tomorrow to hear detailed reports from the leadership of the soviet and the executive committee, and, proceeding from this, to start elaborating a system of measures to prepare the city for new economic relationships—simultaneously with the adoption of a decision in the USSR Supreme Soviet.

We consider it advisable to appeal on behalf of the Moscow Soviet of People's Deputies to all workers and residents of the city with an explanation of the situation, the near-term outlook, proposals on joint actions to normalize the trade situation, and the prevention of mass abuses.

We should concentrate on completing the formation of an executive committee, on whom the implementation of the planned measures depends. We must first of all examine candidacies and confirm deputy chairmen of the executive committee, and at least the managers of today's most important city services and economic units. Give the permanent commissions one to two days to

elaborate their recommendations. Elect the additional two chairmen to the presidium of the soviet, and put off other inadequately coordinated proposals so as not to spend work time on them unnecessarily.

We must declare a break in the work of the session only after resolving the submitted and, in our opinion, really most pressing problems. Subsequently, ensure greater effectiveness of the meeting sessions by virtue of thorough preparation of each question submitted for consideration.

We ask the deputies to support these proposals, and the presidium to submit them to a vote.

[Dated] 29 May 1990.

Gidaspov Interviewed on Multiparty System

PM0207135390 London BBC Television Network
in English 2130 GMT 29 Jun 90

[From the "Newsnight" program: Interview with Lenin-grad party chief Boris Gidaspov by Jeremy Paxman]

[Text] [Gidaspov, speaking in Russian, with superimposed English translation] Our country cannot exist in the form in which it was founded after the revolution. When we started perestroika we immediately said that it was the creation of a new society and therefore the role of the Communist Party will be determined by its political influence on the intellectual life of people, on the politics of solving social and economic problems.

[Paxman] When you think 10, 15, 20 years ahead, are you thinking of a country in which one man and one woman have a vote and the freedom to choose whatever political party they want as a potential government? Are you prepared to let that happen?

[Gidaspov] Yes, of course I would allow that and, in general, it will not be a bad thing. It will even be a good thing. Only a battle of opinions and a battle of ideas can lead to a genuine move forward. You cannot possibly imagine it any other way, and all of our problems are a result of the fact that we did not have that sharp battle of opinions.

[Paxman] But would that not be a betrayal of the revolution?

[Gidaspov] No, why? It will not be a betrayal of the revolution, it would be a normal development of our society. We are not rejecting the communist idea. The communist idea was not invented by leaders or born of some class: It was an idea developed by humanity. It was probably born at the same time as Christ.

[Paxman] Are you serious?

[Gidaspov] Of course. Do you have any doubts?

[Paxman] It is a remarkable thing for a man in your position to be saying.

[Gidaspov] The most important thing against which we always fought—when I say "we," I mean the Communist Party of the Soviet Union—is that political confrontation should never turn into social confrontation. There will be a multiparty system and each party will fight for its influence in society, and that is all. And I cannot see anything bad in that.

Vorotnikov Views Party's 'Degree of Blame'

LD3006164290

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1922 GMT on 29 June, in its "Vzyglad," or "View," program being filmed in Samara, carries a 5-minute feature on the representation in the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] leadership.

The feature begins with video of a correspondent seated on the river bank, reading an excerpt from a Samara newspaper of 17 October 1912. The article highlights the parochial nature of the discussion at the town council. The correspondent notes, "Judging by the agenda, the Samara predecessors of today's elected representatives were fortunate people."

The video then switches to the Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies. Vitaliy Vorotnikov is shown with the caption, "Communists of Russia Parliamentary Group." An unidentified correspondent asks, "There is a fairly widely held opinion that the communists are to blame for much, if not indeed for everything. Do you share in this blame and indeed do you share this position, or not? Your response." Vorotnikov replies, "I would say that is a very primitive way of looking at things. You cannot lay all the blame for what has come about on all communists. To some extent the Communist Party does, of course, bear responsibility for the situation that has evolved in the country. But it would be unfair to lay it on the whole of the party." "As a member of the party leadership, do you believe you bear a degree of blame?" the correspondent asks, to which Vorotnikov answers, "Most likely. Most likely."

Over shots of the congress proceedings, including Yeltsin in the chair, the correspondent reads out an advertisement placed in a Samara newspaper in 1912 by a tailors' company. This is followed by V. Yegorov, a non-party deputy, recalling how his forefathers went to Siberia on foot, drawn by the prospect of freedom and land. Deputy N. Tolstoy from the Smena parliamentary group claims the Supreme Soviet is not made to take resolute steps. Another advertisement from the 1912 newspaper is read.

The next interview is with Ivan Polozkov, identified as an independent deputy. He says, "Because it has been defrauded and affronted, and is unprotected, Russia as a republic needs political protection. People, both communists and non-party, as like as not see in the creation of a Communist Party the means by which to provide political protection for the rebirth, shall we say, of Russia and for Russia's independence. Of course, I believe in the strength of the Communist Party, an

overhauled Communist Party, as the leader of those transformations which the people of our country await."

This interview is followed by a video clip of Deputy S. Andropov of the Workers' and Peasants' Union, who says "We are totally opposed to the communists of Russia faction. We are very surprised, in the first place, that they speak on behalf of all Russia's communists and try to speak on behalf of the working class. This, of course, does not accord with the truth, since all its life the Communist Party has masqueraded behind the working class and since it deceived the working class right at the very beginning, by inciting it to rebel. They came to power through this rebellion and what did the workers get? We now know that all you have to do is stroll through the works and factories and see the conditions in which the workers work. Then stroll through these palaces and just see how our leaders live!"

A brief remark by an agrarian deputy is followed by another excerpt from a 1912 newspaper. N. Chelnokov of the democratic Russia is then interviewed. He notes "Socialism and capitalism do not exist separately. The capitalism in existence in Marx's times has not been around for a long time. What there has been is a highway for the development of mankind. We turned off that highway. We need to get back onto the normal, civilized way for mankind's development."

Moscow Official Senses Air of Change

LD3006143190 Moscow TASS in English 1228 GMT 30 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Lev Aksenov]

[Text] Moscow June 30 TASS—A sense of change, a feeling that the future of Russia and the entire country is being shaped is in the air, Moscow Vice-Mayor Sergey Stankevich told reporters here today.

"Two alternatives for the country's future have taken shape. On the one hand, the dogmatic orthodox conservative wing in the Soviet Communist Party has consolidated, as became clear at the founding congress of the Russian Communist Party. On the other, the Democratic Movement within the party, and even more outside it, has become more organized and consolidated," Stankevich said.

Stankevich, who has been elected as delegate to the forthcoming 28th party congress, spoke in detail about the situation in the party.

The current crisis in the party can be overcome if radical democratic forces and centrist supporters of Gorbachev's reforms draw ranks, he said.

"The time has come to make a choice. The congress, which opens on Monday, and subsequent developments, will be crucial for the disposition of forces in the party," he said.

Commenting on the first session of the Moscow City Council, Stankevich said that it had passed a package of documents designed to promote market relations in the city.

He praised the decision to declare land and buildings (except housing) municipal property.

The decision enters into force on July 1, and also concerns buildings owned by the Communist Party.

Stankevich described as "very important" the decision, taken on Friday, to gradually turn state-provided flats into Muscovites' private property. "This will change property relations and power structures in the city," he said.

The newly-elected city council is qualified and promises to become an active body of power in the city, he said.

"We all lack political and general culture and sometimes fail to see the difference between a rally and a council session," he said.

Leningrad Mayor, Party Chief View Congress

PM2906112890 London ITV Television Network in English 1900 GMT 26 Jun 90

[Editorial Report] London ITV television network in English at 1900 GMT 26 Jun carries a four-minute report from Leningrad by David Smith reports on how reforms are being sabotaged.

Video shows Yeltsin meeting with the new patriarch of the Russian Orthodox Church, visiting St. Isaac's Cathedral, and meeting with Leningrad's new mayor, Anatoliy Sobchak. Video also shows Russians attending church services and interior views of the cathedral including Yeltsin, Sobchak, the new patriarch, and Leningrad party chief Boris Gidasov seated together.

Sobchak and Gidasov speak to David Smith "the other day" in Russian with English subtitles. Gidasov says: "We are going to the 28th party congress with our proposals on how to improve things, but everything needs to be discussed. The results will influence not just the destiny of the party but the fate of the country."

Video shows Leningrad City Hall and meetings held inside, lines for gasoline and food, citizens complaining about food shortages. Sobchak says: "There are many people here interested in making sure that democratic forces fail. From the very first day on the job here I've come across sabotage. Constant obstacles have been put in our way to prevent normal work. For example, the city's trade unionists and workers have been for years faithful servants of the party. Today their loyalties are still to the party."

Video shows interior shots of the LENINSKAYA PRAVDA offices and the local television station. Smith asks: "Where will you go after the party congress? Your own way?" Gidasov replies: "I don't believe the party

will split at the congress, though you can't rule out such a possibility; but the fact is, the various programs are coming closer to each other. You can see it in discussions in Leningrad party organizations and at our Russian Conference." Sobchak says: "A victory for the democrats would give the party a chance to keep its unity, but judging by the people who have been chosen as delegates—and 40 percent of them are party functionaries—it is hard to believe the democrats will win. And so a split is inevitable, and a lot of members of the party who support the democratic platform will leave."

Video shows Yeltsin and Sobchak leaving church to applause.

Sverdlovsk Soviet Head Vlasov Voted Out

PM0207125190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
28 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Own correspondent Aleksandr Pashkov report: "Vote of No Confidence in Oblast Soviet Chairman"]

[Text] Sverdlovsk—More changes have been made in the Sverdlovsk Oblast leadership. A. Gusev, first secretary of the party obkom [oblast committee], resigned quite recently. And now someone else has resigned—has been forced to resign, in fact—V. Vlasov, chairman of the oblast soviet, who was elected to this position just a month ago.

Two points of view emerged at the second session of the oblast soviet. A group of deputies passed a vote of no confidence in V. Vlasov "because of his insincerity and political games": While running as candidate for RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] deputy, he publicly announced his support for B. Yeltsin, but during the Congress of People's Deputies he opposed his nomination for the post of chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet. What is more, he tried to present his own personal point of view as the opinion of the public.

Some deputies believed that V. Vlasov's speech at the conference in the CPSU Central Committee reflected his personal stand and that to condemn him and demand his resignation would be tantamount to encroaching on democracy and pluralism of opinions.

The question eventually developed into a discussion of the problems of glasnost and democratization and a debate on the style of conduct of a politician elected by the people and responsible before them. Deputy G. Burbulis proposed that, in the event of V. Vlasov's resignation being accepted (it was eventually accepted by an overwhelming majority), they should not be in a hurry to elect a new oblast soviet chairman but should wait until the fall, when the question of reorganizing the soviet management system might be raised.

Social Democratic Party Sets Up Western Group

LD0107075490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
0500 GMT 1 Jun 90

[Text] In Kaliningrad an inaugural meeting has been held to set up a western regional organization of the Social Democratic Party of the Russian Federation. Among the founders are participants in the informal movements and organizations, and representatives of labor collectives and creative unions of the republic.

Social Democratic Party Formed in Dagestan

PM0207153590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
26 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Report by correspondent Ali Kazikhanov: "New Party in Dagestan"]

[Text] Makhachkala—The founding congress of the Social Democratic Party of Dagestan has been held.

The new party grew out of the "Perestroika" informal club—whose membership comprises mainly around 150 representatives of the autonomous republic's intelligentsia—which is registered at the Dagestan branch of the USSR Academy of Sciences. The club members participated in the work of the founding congress of the Social Democratic Party of Russia, which was held in May and which decided to create the Social Democratic Party of Dagestan.

The basic principles of the new Dagestan party are democratic union, reason and competence, rejection of any form of dictatorship, violence or leaderism, and the separation of ideology from the state.

"We will act as a parliamentary party that relies in its political activity on the will of the electorate and is geared to the quest for accord among different social forces," the leaders of the new social organization say. "We have been more meticulous than the Social Democratic Party of Russia in mapping out the national-state system and political reform in Dagestan. On the nationalities question we renounce authoritarian methods of tackling it and believe that dialogue is the only acceptable way."

Trade Unionists Campaign for Worker Rights

LD0107081690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
0700 GMT 1 Jul 90

[Text] It has been decided to hold a campaign for unity of action among the trade unions of Russia in defense of working people's social and economic rights from 10 to 20 July. This proposal was first put forward by the participants in the inter-regional trade union conference on social and economic problems of the north, recently held in Murmansk. It has now been supported by the presidium of the Federation of Independent Trade Unions in the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic.

The unity campaign will coincide with political actions planned by the miners. We remind you that the miners plan to strike on 11 July. In this way, the trade union federation, is as it were, expressing support for the miners' just socioeconomic demands. During the 10-day campaign meetings and demonstrations will be held in northern towns and settlements.

Russian Leaseholders' Split Avoided

PM1806141700 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
16 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Own information] report: "Union of Leaseholders of Russia Established"]

[Text] The Constituent Congress of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Union of Leaseholders and Entrepreneurs has been held in Moscow.

It was attended by more than 400 delegates from various parts of Russia. B.N. Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, conveyed his greetings to the congress delegates.

As reported in IZVESTIYA earlier, during the period of preparations for this forum a split very nearly occurred in the ranks of its organizers. It is therefore a pleasure to note that they managed to reach mutual understanding and create a businesslike working atmosphere at the congress. All delegates representing the interests of regional associations of the republic's leaseholders expressed themselves in favor of joining the Union.

Well-known surgeon and entrepreneur, USSR People's Deputy S.N. Fedorov, has been elected president of the republic union.

Moscow Journalists Union Constituted

LD2806212490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1800 GMT 28 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow journalists decided today to set up an independent self-administrating union. The rally, which started as a meeting of staff of the capital's media, was elevated to the level of the constituent congress of the Moscow Journalists' Union. Gusev, editor of the MOSKOVSKIY KOMSOMOLET, was elected chairman of the union by a show of hands from several candidates.

Moscow Starts Privatizing Housing, Consumer Trade

PM0207142390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
1 Jul 90 Morning Edition p1

[A. Davydov report: "Housing to Become Muscovites' Property"]

[Text] Moscow—The 29 June sitting of the Moscow City Soviet adopted a number of important decisions which will mean major changes in life in the capital.

As of 1 July this year, "all uninhabited detached buildings and uninhabited premises located in buildings belonging to the state housing stock" are to become the municipal property of the city soviet. All previous orders regarding uninhabited premises and buildings are canceled.

Under another decision, it is considered expedient to begin transferring state housing stock to individuals by making housing the personal property of Muscovites on a voluntary basis, free of charge, within the limits of established, socially guaranteed norms and in line with the principles of social justice.

The session also approved a complex of measures to develop the consumer market in goods and services. Under the provisions of this document, standard distribution of goods is to be combined with the gradual introduction of prices which evolve in the conditions of a market economy, but with social protection for the population being observed. So-called "Moscow checks" or "social money"—which guarantee that Muscovites will be able to obtain basic consumer goods at set state prices, with the simultaneous development of free trade—are being given the right to exist in the capital. The mechanism for regulating the formation of market prices for goods and services will be formed by using local taxes and paying compensation to Muscovites on this basis.

It is planned to decentralize, denationalize, and demonopolize the consumer market in goods and services and give full economic independence to wholesale bases, stores, canteens, restaurants, workshops, and so forth. Irrespective of their departmental jurisdiction, wholesale and retail trade enterprises, public catering, consumer services, and the hotel industry are to become municipal, collective, family, or individual property. At the same time, unwarranted privileges in supplying canteens, diners, and workshops are to be abolished and stricter controls established over the work of bases and stores.

Perm Exhibition To Be Used as Business Center

PM0207153990 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1400 GMT 28 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast; report by Mikhail Klepov, identified by newscaster]

[Text] [Announcer] A business center is being set up in Perm. Our correspondent Mikhail Klepov has the details.

[Correspondent] The signboard is being removed from the building of the Perm Oblast Exhibition of National Economic Achievements. I recall how it was opened more than 10 years ago. It was a great event, including a rally where labor records were reported, followed by stormy applause. No one is thinking about this now. The Oblast Exhibition of National Economic Achievements meant an annual loss of some 300,000 rubles (R). No one

knows how it would have ended had the local commercial bank not shown interest in the building. Having consulted its shareholders, who include more than 30 major industrial enterprises in the western Urals, the bank's board decided to buy the building in question. This meant an expenditure of more than R1 million. But the end justified the means, as they say.

[A.A. Klimov, deputy chairman of the commercial bank board, identified by caption] In conditions of the transition to market relations, which is getting closer and closer, a great many problems are arising.

Technical facilities are necessary for the normal functioning of the market, that is, facilities where business people can exchange goods, conclude contracts, and exchange information. This is a very complex matter. Special organizations, business centers, all kind of financial and commodity exchanges, and so on and so forth, exist for this purpose in civilized countries.

So we put our heads together and started working out what needs to be done here in the Urals, and specifically in Perm, to resolve the question of a technical base. And we decided to make use of this building. A business center will be established here which we hope will become one of Russia's major centers for the development of market relations at the most up-to-date level.

Rally in Archangel Protests Nuclear Test Site

LD0406221490 *Vilnius Domestic Service in Russian*
1920 GMT 4 Jun 90

[Text] Nowadays many people are worried by the economic and ecological situation, especially in the area of the White Sea. We have received a resolution from a rally held on this matter in Archangel on 1 May this year. Here is what it says in part:

Thirty-three years ago, by a resolution of the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers, the islands of Novaya Zemlya were taken away from their indigenous inhabitants, the Nenets. Since then the archipelago has been outside the jurisdiction of Archangel Oblast: the military built a nuclear test site on it. Local residents started to notice the appearance of fish without scales and the disappearance of [word indistinct] from [word indistinct] deer. Today, in connection with the scrapping of the nuclear test site near the city of Semipalatinsk, the Novaya Zemlya archipelago will become the only nuclear laboratory of Moscow politicians, and this means that the quantity of explosions there will increase sharply. Belousov, the chairman of the state committee of the USSR Council of Ministers for Military and Industrial Questions, completely rejected the appeal of the residents of the Nenets Okrug [national district] to scrap the nuclear test site, citing as his reasons that that is how things are for the time being. Belousov also gave assurances to the nuclear test site. However, in August 1987, as a result of an underground nuclear explosion in Novaya Zemlya, there was an emission into the atmosphere of radioactive iodine 131. The scale of

that pollution can be gauged if only by the fact that a protest was lodged by the Norwegians. We participants in the protest rally consider that one must not fight for international security by methods dangerous for one's own people and against its will. We appeal to the city committee and the soviet of people's deputies, and demand an end to nuclear testing on the islands of Novaya Zemlya, and that the islands of Novaya Zemlya be handed over to their indigenous inhabitants. In connection with the appearance of continued construction of the atomic power station, we demand the creation of a commission of the oblast soviet to monitor construction.

Anti-Nuclear Protests Held in Ural Regions

LD2306180990 *Moscow Domestic Service in Russian*
1500 GMT 23 Jun 90

[Text] We have already reported that an interregional anti-nuclear protest march has started simultaneously in Bashkiriya and Tatariya. Its participants are coming out in favor of halting the construction of nuclear power stations in the republics and of declaring the territories of Bashkiriya, Tatariya, and Udmurtiya nuclear-free zones. There is a municipal rally in Ufa today. Taking part in it are all those concerned at the fate of future generations and the future of the Earth.

Liquor To Be Rationed in Leningrad

LD3006123190 *Moscow Maritime Service in Russian*
0615 GMT 30 Jun 90

[Text] Ration cards for wines and spirits are to be introduced in July [in Leningrad] and spirits sold in excess of allowances will cost 75 percent more. This decision has been made by Lensovet in the hope of stopping the upsurge of black-marketeering and the things going on in the liquor store lines, which are such a disgrace to our city. It seems that over the last few years it has been finally officially recognized that the temptation to drink is not just a matter of individual disorders, but disorder in society as a whole.

Western Republics

'Moldovan Peoples Front' Congress Ends

Debates on Issues Viewed

PM0207161590 *Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian*
3 Jul 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Eduard Kondratov report under the "Direct Line" rubric: "People's Front Congress"]

[Text] Kishinev—The keenest debates at the Popular Front of Moldova [PFM] Congress were on a provision of the statutes which declares membership of the People's Front incompatible with membership of any political party. The congress approved this provision.

It goes without saying that this was aimed primarily at membership of the CPSU. Bearing in mind that the congress represented 35,000 PFM members and more than 200,000 of its active supporters, a major exodus of people from the Communist Party is to be expected.

The PFM proclaimed its main aim to be the attainment of state independence for the Romanian territories to the east of the River Prut and the creation of a rule-of-law state—the Romanian Republic of Moldova. A resolution was adopted on the restoration of the ethnonyms "Romanian people" and "Romanian language"—on the grounds that the ethnonym "Moldavian" was merely a means of removing the national identity of Romanians east of the Prut. The documents included resolutions on the need to withdraw the military occupation units and organs of the CPSU and the KGB on the republic's territory, to annul the decision of 2 August 1940 on the creation of the Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR], on the return of Romanian lands transferred to the Ukraine at that time, on independence of the national church from the Russian church, and on ending the financing of military commissariats and quashing the punishments imposed on those who refused to serve in the Soviet Army.

A number of appeals were adopted. There is an appeal to the Romanian people of Moldova to be imbued with a consciousness of their national allegiance, a request to ethnic minorities to support the efforts of the Romanian nation which is striving for the independence of Moldova, and a request to parliamentary deputies that parliament adopt a resolution on the renaming of all enterprises, collective farms, and state farms bearing names associated with communist ideas or the name of Lenin, whose monuments should be removed everywhere.

After long debates on whether the PFM should become a party or remain a sociopolitical movement, it was decided that its status should not be changed. The poet Ion Khadyrke, first deputy chairman of the Moldova SSR Supreme Soviet, was re-elected head of the PFM.

A referendum was held in the city of Bender 1 July, in which around 80 percent of inhabitants took part. Nine out of 10 voted against the "Tricolor" on the territory of their city soviet, and almost all voted for the creation of an association [assotsiatsiya] of unions [obiedineniye] of Bender and Tiraspol within the framework of the law on local self-management and for the expediency of the city of Bender joining the Dnestr Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic in the event of its formation.

New Charter, Program Adopted

LD0207112190 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1007 GMT 2 Jul 90

[Text] Kishinev, 2 Jul (TASS)—The basic aim of the Popular Front of Moldova will be to achieve sovereignty for the republic and expand the rights of its indigenous population. This is proclaimed by a new charter and

program which were adopted at the second congress of this organization which has ended here.

The majority of delegates spoke out against turning the PFM into a party and voted to retain its status as a popular front. According to a new clause, members of the PFM are banned from membership of any party. The charter envisages close interaction with public and political organizations which have aims similar to those of the PFM.

The second congress of the PFM adopted several resolutions including one "On the Status of the Soviet Army on the Territory of Moldova". A resolution "On the National Church" talks of the need to create an Orthodox Romanian Autocephalous Church of Bessarabia, (Transnistriya), and North Bukovina.

Ion Khadyrke, a USSR republican People's Deputy and deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet of Moldova was reelected chairman of the PFM.

Moldavian Party Congress Discusses Draft Platform

PM2205110290 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
19 May 90 Second Edition p 2

[ATEM, TASS report: "Congress Continues"]

[Text] Kishinev, 18 May—The 17th Moldavian Communist Party Congress continued in Kishinev today. The delegates discussed the Central Committee's political report and the report of the Moldavian Communist Party auditing commission.

Stormy debates broke out over the future of the republic Communist Party. Although different and sometimes diametrically opposed views were expressed on its autonomy, the vast majority of delegates see it as a united party on the platform of a renewed CPSU.

Many lances were also broken in the course of the discussion of the question of the role and place of the party press in the republic's mass media system. The political report put forward a proposal on a single press organ for the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee—the newspaper MOLDOVA SOCHIALISTE, published in Moldavian with Russian translation. It is proposed to turn the newspaper SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA into a Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee weekly. But the majority of delegates did not support this thesis, believing that the republic party organization should have two press organs of equal status.

At the evening session the delegates embarked on the discussion of the draft CPSU Central Committee Platform for the 28th party congress and the draft CPSU Statutes.

The delegates adopted a resolution on the Central Committee report and a congress resolution on the draft CPSU Central Committee Platform for the 28th party congress and the draft CPSU Statutes.

P.K. Luchinskiy was elected first secretary of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee in an open ballot.

The congress continues.

Cities Reject 'Moldova' Constitution

PM0207124590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
28 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Own correspondent Eduard Kondratov report: "Cities Showing Rebelliousness"]

[Text] Kishinev—A series of laws and constitutional articles of the SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] of Moldova have been declared invalid in the territories within the administrative jurisdiction of the cities of Tiraspol, Bendery, and Rybnitsa and Rybnitskiy Rayon. That is the decision of recent local soviet sessions.

Inhabitants of the left bank of the Dnestr and the city of Bendery refuse to recognize the tricolor flag as the republic's state flag, consider the laws on language discriminatory, and feel that the recently adopted laws on measures to bring criminal charges for ignoring national emblems, desecrating the state flag, and encroaching on the republic's territorial integrity are draconian.

The local soviet sessions also refused to recognize the resolution adopted by the republic Supreme Soviet session, which abolished celebration of the reunification holiday, June 28—the 50th anniversary of Soviet troops' entry into Bessarabia—will still be celebrated in cities and villages on the other side of the Dnestr.

Moldavian Premier Forced To Resign

PM2805141390 Moscow KRSNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 26 May 90 First Edition p 6

[Report by Colonel N. Mulyar under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Resigned"]

[Text] Kishinev—The Moldavian Supreme Soviet session, which resumed work after a recess, has again fueled the atmosphere in the republic. One day, when deputies went out into the street after a routine sitting, the emotions of those who have recently been picketing the Supreme Soviet building spilled over. A crowd of young people wearing blue headbands attacked the parliamentarians. Several deputies were beaten, some went back into the hall and were then taken to a hotel under militia guard. That night the deputies' delegation from Tiraspol left Kishinev.

On 23 May the "Sovetskaya Moldaviya" deputies' group issued a statement to the Moldavian people, the president of the USSR, and the Union republics' Supreme Soviets demanding that a special commission be set up within the Moldavian Supreme Soviet to elaborate effective measures to normalize the situation in Kishinev and the republic as a whole and to call those responsible for its destabilization to account.

I would add that the already complex sociopolitical situation has been aggravated by groups of local militants trying to bar the way into the republic military commissariat's draft station.

In this situation, P. Paskar, chairman of the republic's Council of Ministers, has stated that, in view of the negative attitude created at the session toward the government's activity, he considers it necessary to hand in his resignation.

Moldavian Government Officials Appointed

LD2706161190

[Editorial Report] Kishinev SOVETSKAYA MOLD-AVIYA in Russian on 6 June publishes on page 2 a decision of the Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet, signed by its chairman, M. Snegur, and dated 29 May 1990, appointing Andrey Nikolayevich Sangeli first deputy chairman of the Moldavian SSR Council of Ministers and minister of agriculture and the food industry.

It also prints a second decision, appointing Konstantin Mikhail Oborok first deputy chairman [as published] of the Moldavian SSR Council of Ministers.

Both decisions are accompanied by brief profiles and photographs of the two men.

Moldavia's Snegur Views Situation, Reforms

PM2106105690 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English
No 23, 17-24 Jun 90 p 6

[Report on undated interview with Moldavian Supreme Soviet Chairman Mircha Snegur by Aleksandr Makhov: "Moldavia: Confrontation And Reform"]

[Text] The first, most violent tremor occurred as I was about to enter my hotel. Looking at the metal vase smashed into two, the receptionist lamented: "Just as I thought: people always get punished if they don't live in peace." Another violent shock came late that night. But the next day the earthquake wasn't the only topic in Kishinev.

The situation there had sharply deteriorated a week before the quake. On May 22 several Moldavians attacked Russian-speaking deputies, members of the Soviet Moldavia group, on their way out of the parliament building after a session. All of them had walked out in protest. Referring to this incident, the government of Moldavia resigned to the surprise of many people.

My job was to file a report on the Chairman of Moldavia's Supreme Soviet, Mircha Snegur. At 8 a.m. when I walked into his office, Snegur had already had two meetings. At 10 he left to chair a session that would discuss the structure of the new cabinet and diplomatic recognition for independent Lithuania.

MN: What's your view of the situation in Moldavia since May 22?

Snegur: I wouldn't call it an impasse, though it might look like one. The confrontation began last summer when it became clear that the Russian speaking officials would be obliged to learn at least one thousand words in Moldavian to be able to communicate with all citizens of the republic. What's so bad about that, you might say. I think that the confrontation by some of the Russian-speaking population is being provoked by certain destructive forces.

MN: But the Russian-speaking deputies at the session walked out after being attacked by extremists.

Snegur: I can't deny that. Extremism can't do any good. But the "brutal beating" of the deputies is an overstatement used by forces which want to destabilize the situation. In fact, the original version of the Soviet Moldavia group called for creating self-defence units at enterprises. I asked them if this would serve consolidation. They edited out that point but it remained in the transcript.

MN: What are you doing to get the Soviet Moldavia group back into parliament?

Snegur: The Supreme Soviet has obliged the law and order bodies to protect the deputies' rights and stop all unlawful actions. There have been virtually no picketers since. Incidentally, half the Soviet Moldavia group is back at the session. Still boycotting it are deputies from Tiraspol and Bendery. They are insisting on draconian measures. [Snegur ends]

I talked with a Soviet Moldavia deputy. Vladimir Kapandzhi is one of the leaders of the Gagauzes national movement. He thinks what happened on May 22 is inadmissible. But staying away from parliament is unreasonable. He says Gagauz deputies are planning to leave the Soviet Moldavia group and form an independent group (Budzhak).

Kishinev journalists just back from Tiraspol said: "It was like a trip to another country." The local Soviets (governments) do not recognize decisions taken by the Moldavian parliament. The Russian-speaking majority in the Dnestr area is outspoken about its hopes of help from Soviet army units stationed near Tiraspol. This can be written off as rumour if not for this fact: a military helicopter bussed one village in the Dnestr area while Moldavian residents were holding a rally. "Where did the chopper come from, who gave orders to fly it and what for, I can't tell," Procurator of Bendery V. Melnik told the Moldavian news agency ATEM.

Back in Moscow I heard that members of all local governments had gathered in Tiraspol over the weekend to discuss the Dnestr autonomy. One of the leaders of Moldavia's parliament said that it would have to make any such decisions null and void. The confrontation continues.

MN: The May 22 events triggered a government crisis in Moldavia. Petr Paksar's cabinet resigned over the deterioration of the sociopolitical situation in Moldavia.

Snegur: I'm not sure if this move was right. Two days later the Supreme Soviet made Mircha Druk, who is not in the CPSU Prime Minister. He presented his plan of establishing a market economy and economic sovereignty for Moldavia within a confederation. [Snegur ends]

Not all the deputies agreed with the new premier's concept, and asked many questions.

"Why is there no state committee for physical education in your plan? Who is going to take care of teaching sports at school?"

"The sports teacher, and the school master. Why create a ministry each time?"

"Mr. Druk, how many ministerial seats are you going to give women?"

"May I repeat: a minister's sex or nationality is irrelevant. Professional qualifications aren't."

"You speak about a new federation. What do you mean?"

"For me, a new federation means a confederation."

(Applause)

The new premier is an economist and a psychologist. He often says he was Gavriil Popov's student. He lives in a small hotel room from which they tried to evict him several days ago in anticipation of Moldavia's Communist Party Congress. ("Vacate the room! Our delegates don't have anywhere to stay.")

MN: A confederation? You are a member of the USSR President's Federation Council. How do you expect Moscow to react to your innovations?

Snegur: We think that the interests of the republics should come first. The USSR should take account of their opinions. The centre still doesn't seem to understand this.

MN: What do you think about the view that the republic's leader should suspend his party membership?

Snegur: I like this view. My own opinion is that we should consider it. Let's say I'm a CPSU member, and my deputy is the Popular Front leader (he would resign as the leader but remain a member of the movement's Great Council). Why do we have to be in all these structures? Everything in due time...As for Snegur, the rub is that his name is associated every time with the position of a Central Committee secretary, a Buro member, since he attended Party meetings and conferences. I think it was easier for Travkin to leave the Party and create a new one. Things are not that simple for a republican leader. [Snegur ends]

Just a few hours later the plenum of the Central Committee of Moldavia's Communist Party proposed that Mircha Snegur become a member of the Buro. Snegur declined the offer.

Moldavian Daily Appeals Against Becoming Weekly
LD3005173590 Kishinev SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA in Russian 18 May 90 p 1

[*Open Letter to the 17th Congress of the Moldavian Communist Party]

[Excerpts] The collective of the editorial office of SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA appeals to you, delegates to the 17th Moldavia Communist Party Congress, with the aims of preventing possible political mistakes in resolving the question of restructuring the party press.

The report by P.K. Luchinskiy, first secretary of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee proposed turning SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA into a weekly paper and depriving it of its status as a Central Committee organ.

We are profoundly convinced that this decision would contradict the fundamental interests of the overwhelming majority of members of the republican party organization and also the interests of our subscribers.

By its very nature a weekly cannot have any tangible influence on the rapidly changing sociopolitical situation and cannot give up to the minute coverage of events. [passage omitted]

There is a growing wave of anti-Sovietism in Moldavia, a wave which is today quite openly under the control of the leaders of certain public movements.

Under the guise of the noble idea of reviving the national language and national culture the fire of extremism is flaring up on an increasingly large scale. Beatings and threats, abuse and intimidation—all these elements of open dictatorship are used extensively and with impunity against anyone who dares espouse any viewpoint which differs in any way from the accepted one. Unfortunately, all these tendencies are intensifying political tension in the republic and leading to the aggravation of confrontation between the nationalities and they are not being repulsed as they should be by the current leaders of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee.

The attack on SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA is also one of the acts planned by destructive forces whose aim is plain for all to see: to deprive one third of the republic's population of its daily press organ in the original Russian language, an organ which could provide up to the minute objective and party-style principled coverage of events occurring in Moldavia. Confirmation that practical steps have already been taken to implement this plan is provided by the proposal made in the political report.

Taking all this into account, we consider it necessary to give the paper the status of a central party organ and

approve the paper's editor at the current congress and also to give the collective of the editorial office more independence in resolving all issues of editorial life and creative work. [passage omitted]

Comrade delegate to the party congress! We ask you to consider again all the arguments for preserving a paper which has faithfully served Soviet people for 65 years and to make your choice.

SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA Editorial Board, Party Buro, and Editorial Trade Union Committee.

Ukrainian Deputies View Prime Minister's Report
LD2505180290 Kiev International Service in English 2300 GMT 24 May 90

[Excerpt] This is Radio Kiev and our feature "Ukraine Today." And we continue this account of today's work of the Ukrainian parliament. Now let's listen to the views of its deputies concerning the report of the Ukraine's prime minister, Vitaliy Masol. Here is one by people's deputy from Kiev, Communist Party member (Ivan Saliy)

I think that Vitaliy Masol should have given us a more concrete and even more emotional report, says (Ivan Saliy). In my opinion, this report lacks the touch of the acute problems which are the concern of the deputies to the Ukrainian parliament. It was too serene and undisturbed, although it contained new ideas concerning the sovereignty of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, said Deputy (Ivan Saliy).

And here's the opinion of Deputy (Roman Lyubkivskiy) from the Ukrainian city of Lvov.

I think that the report delivered to us by Vitaliy Masol is rather superficial and reflecting the common statements made by all governments in their accounts, says (Roman Lyubkivskiy). For example, we didn't hear about who is guilty of the catastrophic situation created in the Ukraine, and we didn't hear concrete proposals so that to fill [as heard] the term sovereignty with concrete sense, to make it all-embracing, and not too abstract as it was in the report, said Deputy (Roman Lyubkivskiy).

And here's the opinion of the people's deputy of the USSR from the city of Chernovtsy, (Leontiy Sandulyak)

What I am waiting for and perhaps what all the people of our republic are waiting for is that the parliament of the Ukraine must adopt a declaration on economic and political independence of the Ukraine, says (Leontiy Sandulyak). I mean an independent state within the renewed federation or union. But they should start with this by all means. And what does economic independence mean? This means that all the resources of the republic must belong to the people of the republic and only to the people—no all-Union property on the territory of the republic. And political independence means that all the laws, international or all-Union, should rule in the republic after their ratification by the Supreme

Soviet of the Ukraine. The Soviet Union in its present state can exist no more. In the nearest future we shall adopt a new union treaty, and many laws being adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet now may appear to be the ones not corresponding to the articles of the new treaty. All the peoples want to live the life a human being deserves, and to do this we must solve a lot of problems which are all the same for the other republics, and solving of all these problems means to get economic and political independence. We can reach the desired level of well-being only in the conditions of decentralization of power and of property, said (Leontiy Sandulyak). [passage omitted]

Ukrainian Social Democrats Congress Continues

LD2805165590 Kiev International Service in Ukrainian
2300 GMT 27 May 90

[Excerpts] The constituent congress of the united Social-Democratic Party of Ukraine started in Kiev yesterday. Today it is continuing its work. Listen to a report by Dmytra Ponomarchuk:

[Ponomarchuk] According to the congress' secretariat, 122 delegates have arrived from 17 oblasts of the republic. In almost every oblast several Social-Democratic organizations are functioning, six of them in Kiev alone. [passage omitted]

This current is not very powerful in our republic—probably about 500 members in all, yet the congress is passing along the edge of a rift. On the left wing of the party there is a group which is referred to be a majority of delegates as splitters. The rest of the left wing is regarded as constructivists. They are eager to cooperate with the right wing which has, in fact, prepared all the basic documents of the congress. This wing is actually in the driving seat at the congress. [passage omitted]

Both wings are uninvolved in any demand for full independence for Ukraine. Instead both of them are concentrating on which section of population the party is going to defend. The majority of the delegates advocate that the party should be the spokesman for employees, small businessmen and property owners, that is to be a replica of western social democracies, especially of those which, by tradition, play the role of leading political forces in the highly developed countries of Europe. [passage omitted]

Tomorrow the congress will elect the ruling organs of the party.

Ukrainian Komsomol Congress Votes for Name Change

PM2206123390 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA
in Russian 19 Jun 90 p 1

[Our Correspondent O. Musafirova report: "I Am Not Going to Leave the LKSMU (MDS)"]

[Text] There were 1,599 delegates attending the Ukrainian Komsomol [Leninist Communist Youth League] Congress which has now ended.

The organization is now called the LKSMU [Lenin Communist Youth League of the Ukraine] (MDS)—Youth for Democratic Socialism. The suffix is tagged on as amplification without changing the essence.

The highlight of the congress was the election of the first secretary. Out of 11 alternative candidates only two remained when it came to the vote: Anatoliy Matviyenko, who was standing for reelection to the post, and Ilgiz Iskhakov, secretary of the Chernobyl Nuclear Power Station Komsomol committee.

Through a combination of circumstances, Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] People's Deputy Anatoliy Matviyenko was nominated for the post of chairman of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet Standing Commission on Youth Affairs. The post required him to resign his former job. But Anatoliy decided to fight for both posts. And he confidently beat Iskhakov by a clear margin, and became first secretary of the LKSMU (MDS) Central Committee... for 24 hours. Because the next day he was elected head of the commission.

So the LKSMU (MDS) Central Committee is now on vacation.

Militia Prevent Attendance at Poltava Rally

PM2905134790 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA
PRAVDA in Russian 24 May 90 p 2

[Our Correspondent O. Musafirova report under the "Chronicle of the Week" rubric: "Poltava"]

[Text] Curious things have been happening in Poltava.

"Don't move, you're under arrest!"

The young sergeants were well trained.

"What are you playing at, I'm a city soviet deputy!" Vitaliy Ivanovich Pokas said, as he tried to present his official identification to the custodians of law and order.

Nor did my press pass card help either, any more than the appeal to the senior officers with whom we were speaking literally a minute before.

And the journalist who showed a professional interest in the action staged in Poltava by the SNUM (Independent Ukrainian Youth Union) was out of luck, too. As were a further 156 people. For some reason people in uniform are again prominent in the ideological struggle. As are people in civilian clothes, too, so as long they have big muscles.

A more detailed account of what happened in Poltava will be published in the next issues of the newspaper.

Gorbachev Sends Belorussia Message on Chernobyl

PM0307084790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
1 Jul 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Own correspondent Mikhail Shimanskiy report under the rubric "Direct Line": "At the Belorussian Supreme Soviet Session"]

[Text] Minsk—Belorussian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet deputies are discussing questions concerning aid to the population of regions hit by the Chernobyl accident.

A group of deputies visited the stricken regions. They were able to see for themselves how terrible life is there since Chernobyl. On their return from the zone, Deputy V. Gribanov said, in particular, that in Krasnopol'skiy Rayon, Mogilev Oblast they had seen the harvest ripening in the village of Novoyel'nya, feed being procured, and truck gardens cultivated. They had measured the level of soil contamination there and found it to be in the region of 200 Curie units per square kilometer. This is the fifth year people have been living in this sick land.

Deputies heard a report from the republic's government on work done to eliminate the consequences of the accident at the Chernobyl nuclear power plant. The report was subjected to strong criticism and parliamentarians raised a multitude of questions, to which they failed to receive full answers from the government.

The Supreme Soviet adopted a decision to invite USSR President M. Gorbachev to the session, as well as former republic leaders N. Slyunkov and G. Tarazevich. Telegrams were sent to them.

M. Gorbachev telephoned the Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet and asked that it be conveyed to people's deputies that he shares the misfortune of the Belorussian people and, as president of the country, will do everything to ensure that the state program to eliminate the consequences of the accident at Chernobyl is implemented in full. He also said that he will visit Belorussia if possible by the end of this year and regrets that he cannot take part in the work of the Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet because of his heavy schedule.

N. Slyunkov said in an answering telegram that he cannot come, because for the last six months his state of health has prevented him from leading a full working life.

G. Tarazevich attended the session in Minsk, gave an address, and gave detailed answers to the numerous, sometimes sharp questions from deputies. We will be frank, however, and say that he had a hard time of it "under the crossfire."

Belorussian Supreme Soviet Session Held 23 Jun

PM0207141190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
24 Jun 90 Second Edition p 2

[BELTA-TASS report under the rubric "Official": "Search for Solutions"]

[Text] Minsk, 23 Jun—The Belorussian Supreme Soviet session has begun examining the republic government's report on the work done to eliminate the aftermath of the accident at the Chernobyl AES [nuclear electric power station] during 1986-1990. A decision was adopted to set up a temporary commission of the Belorussian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet to assess the activity of officials and other responsible persons in connection with the elimination of the aftermath of the accident.

A.T. Kichkaylo, deputy chairman of the Belorussian SSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau and Belorussian SSR Council of Ministers Commission for Eliminating the Aftermath of the Accident at the Chernobyl AES, delivered the republic government's report.

The Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet deputies decided to suspend their work and visit the affected rayons at the beginning of next week in order to familiarize themselves with the state of affairs on the spot.

Before this, at the suggestion of a group of parliamentarians, the session deviated from discussing the agenda to elect the chairman of the Belorussian SSR Council of Ministers, who must urgently participate in concluding economic treaties with other sovereign republics. After accepting the resignation of the government, which has been entrusted with fulfilling its duties until the new cabinet of ministers is formed, V.F. Kebich, who held this post previously, was elected chairman of the Belorussian SSR Council of Ministers.

Belorussian Central Committee Plenum Held

PM0207140590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
24 Jun 90 Second Edition p 2

[Report by correspondents A. Simurov and A. Ulitenok under the rubric "Official": "Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum"]

[Text] Minsk, 23 Jun—Let us remember that the Belorussian Communist Party congress will be held in the fall. Therefore the party documents for the 28th CPSU Congress were discussed at today's plenum of the republic party organization's Central Committee. The report was published three days before the plenum. This helped to deepen the debate.

The Damoclean sword of Chernobyl hangs over the Belorussians. This conclusion was drawn at the plenum: The Chernobyl tragedy has caused no pain to those who were to blame for it. In this connection the way communists at the Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic

Supreme Soviet session formulated the question of the USSR Ministry of Nuclear Power Generation and the Nuclear Industry compensating for the harm done to the republic was deemed rightful.

The plenum participants defined their positions on fundamental questions in the life of the party.

***Thousands Allegedly Destroy Party Cards**

90UN2201A Minsk SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA
in Russian 6 Jun 90 p 1

[BELTA report: "The Deputy Exaggerates...."]

[Text] Addressing the Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet on 19 May, Belorussian SSR People's Deputy Z.S. Poznyak stated that at a mass meeting held in Minsk on 18 May, thousands of communists had burned their party cards and that he had witnessed this act. The following is quoted verbatim from the session stenographic record: "Just what have we gotten out of this? Yesterday evening we got several thousand people burning their party cards in front of the Lenin Memorial. When have we ever had anything like this in Minsk? This was a spontaneous action; I was an eyewitness."

As was reported by the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee department of party organizations and cadre work, it has been established that one person did in fact burn her party card. This person was T.G. Goranskaya, a member of the CPSU from 1973, head of the department of projects to assist in the restoration and utilization of historical and cultural sites and landmarks of the Belorussian republic branch of the Soviet Cultural Foundation.

The primary party organization took up this matter on 31 May 1990 and expelled her from CPSU membership.

Eyewitnesses confirm that approximately 10 Komsomol cards were also burned on that day.

These are the facts. As for the "thousands of people" who allegedly burned their party cards, this is nothing but a figment of Z.S. Poznyak's imagination.

Minsk Leader's Attacks on 'Center' Assailed

PM2806134790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
26 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Report by correspondent Nikolay Matukovskiy: "Yet Another Attempt To Exploit Emotions"]

[Text] Minsk—A Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum was held 23 June. For the first time in the history of the republican party organization the Central Committee first secretary's report was published in the press three days before the plenum. Everyone pointed out that this was one example of the democratization of intraparty life. But the readers of republican papers also pointed out that at no time in the entire history of the republic's party organization have its leaders leveled such crushing criticism at the "Moscow

bosses"—CPSU Central Committee, Politburo, and Central Committee general secretary (although without naming names). In some places this criticism sounded, to be frank, rather "unparliamentary" and improper coming from a party leader.

On the eve of the plenum the republican youth paper ZNAMYA YUNOSTI published a long article entitled "Steering to the Right?" It was a critique of Yefrem Yevseyevich Sokolov's report "Firmly Uphold the Socialist Choice!" The article was signed by the paper's editor, Aleksandr Klaskovskiy.

There follows an abridged account of the article "Steering to the Right?"

"...The first thing you notice is the unprecedented strong criticism of the so-called center. Many paragraphs are, frankly, riddled with poorly disguised hostility toward its entire policy over the past five years. Here is the leitmotiv: 'In our view, the fact that our ship has lost its anchors and everyone is a little seasick... is largely the fault of those who are in charge of the ship's crew and set its course.' [punctuation as published] ...One would like to ask our ship's mutinous boatswains: Didn't you feel sick when you were singing hallelujah choruses to the former captains, impotent old men, decorating their chests with stars for having so comprehensively run us aground? Everything was fine and dandy, was it, when our ship was stranded in the putrid mud of the harbor of stagnation? Before casting a rock at the present captain, it is worth considering why we are having feverishly to plug a multitude of holes in the hull. Is it not because for decades the hull has been eaten into by the corrosion of dogmatism, immorality, and other products of monstrous totalitarianism? Indeed, our ship has now entered new, uncharted waters and faces an entirely different set of coordinates: political pluralism, market economy—all this is unusual and it worries and even frightens many people. But is this argument really serious: 'Any of us could name dozens of countries where neither the market nor private ownership has saved people from poverty and hunger...' Perhaps someone could name just one country where they have managed to achieve prosperity by ignoring the laws of the market? Is the comparison of, for example, economies and living standards in the GDR and FRG, North and South Korea, Czechoslovakia and Austria, the Baltic republics and Scandinavia—that is, between neighbors who, at a certain point in history, have chosen different political systems and economic models, with the attitude toward the market marking the watershed—not eloquent enough...

"And all that fuss about the capitalists buying us out lock, stock, and barrel tomorrow and subjecting us to ruthless exploitation. But let us be absolutely honest. Let us remember that at the moment it is our own socialist state, whose banner bears slogans about the welfare of working people, that is the most ruthless exploiter, depriving the hired worker of a far bigger percentage of surplus value than the most hardened capitalist... Is it not time to consider why, for so many years, we have

talked about social protection and concern for ordinary working people while reducing them to poverty, empty shelves, and the brutalizing experience of waiting in endless lines? It is the easiest thing in the world to exploit bitterness, to spark off lumpen, primitive egalitarian emotions, and, under that banner, to herd everyone back into a crude bureaucratic system. The danger of that has never been greater.

"...The report we are discussing here on several occasions draws a parallel with events in East Europe. Certainly the processes taking place there are dramatic and by no means unambiguous. However, in discussing this topic, it would not hurt to dig down to the roots and see the underlying processes... Let us frankly admit right away that they were hostages of our diktat, of our totalitarianism at home. And let us not be in too much of a hurry to talk about 'so-called people's movements in certain East European countries.' We must not put everything down to extremists' intrigues! The grapes of wrath have long been ripening among the broad people's masses..."

"...It is sheer blasphemy to talk about 'great achievements' and 'historic gains' when a vast country, abounding in resources, has been reduced to unprecedented ignominy, hunger, and decay. The same goes for pride in bellicose orthodoxy of outlook, when the exact opposite is required—clearing the way once and for all, as quickly as possible, by shrewd, fearless, radical thought, in order to save our society from total collapse. A salvation that is still possible. Possible, unless, in the next fit of mass blindness, we succumb to the command certain people have been waiting a long time to give: 'Steer to the right!'..."

We saw fit to provide such a detailed account of the article from ZNAMYA YUNOSTI for three reasons. The first is that the Central Committee members somehow overlooked the weakness of many of the theses in Ye. Ye. Sokolov's report (as a matter of fact, there was no discussion of the report, there were various pronouncements of a "routine" nature and really business-like, hard-hitting speeches). Second, Ye. Sokolov, by aiming his critical fire at the headquarters, avoided serious criticism of the republican Communist Party Central Committee he leads and of himself. Yet he has been a CPSU Central Committee member for many years and many of the strictures he directed against others could just as well have been directed against himself. Third, it is a fact that the republic's leaders and ordinary working people adopt opposite approaches toward assessing the events of recent years. On the eve of the 28th congress one should not be harping on this "pluralism" and fueling emotions. It is necessary to unite in order to refloat our common ship through common efforts. The most essential thing in this kind of situation is a sober assessment of one's own stance in the past, present, and future. We have had enough of pointing the finger at one another and looking for culprits elsewhere. It does no good.

Western Attitudes on Sovereignty Analyzed

LD2906103490 Kiev LITERATURNIA UKRAYINA
in Ukrainian 21 Jun 90 p3

[Excerpts] Mrs. Margaret Thatcher, prime minister of Great Britain, met with people's deputies of the republic at the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet. During an exchange with deputies she gave a very evasive answer to a question from Deputy Ivan Zayets on possibilities for the Ukraine to directly participate in the general European process. Our correspondent approached Volodymyr Vasylenko, professor at Kiev University, expert on international law, and member of the Ukrainian mission at the United Nations in New York.

Correspondent: How can you explain the way Mrs. Thatcher answered this question?

Vasylenko: This was a typical display of the traditional, excessively cautious, and—to a considerable degree—prejudiced position of the Western powers toward the Soviet Union republics. In the West they see our Union republics not as national sovereign states, but as ordinary administrative-territorial units, similar to those making such classic federations as the United States or Canada, and which, owing to this, are not recognized as subjects of international law. From a formally juridical point of view this attitude ignores Article 80 of the USSR Constitution which declares that every union republic "has the right to enter into relationships with foreign states, to conclude treaties with them, and exchange diplomatic and consular missions as well as to take part in the work of international organizations." However, they act this way not without a reason since in practice these constitutional prerogatives are exercised to a certain degree only by two Union republics—the Belorussian and Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republics, mainly through their membership at the United Nations. [passage omitted]

The main reason for this paradoxical and clearly abnormal state of affairs lies in the super-centralization constructed by the administrative-command system which deprives Union republics of freedom of action in both the internal and external spheres. As a result, the actual ground was prepared for the Western powers to ignore the Union republics and their national interests. During the cold war period, Western powers were also governed by the striving to prevent the USSR having "extra" votes in various international forums. Their present refusal to recognize the Union republics as subjects of international law and establish official relations with them is often explained by their unwillingness to destabilize the situation in the USSR and, consequently, in East Europe and in Europe as a whole. However, the social tension within the framework of the USSR is fed not by the striving of Union republics to have direct relations with other states of the world, but by the lasting ignoring of the national needs of Union republics on the part of all-Union bodies. Stability in Europe can be ensured not through the preservation of

the totalitarian empire, but through construction of a union of genuinely sovereign states, each of which could have real and direct participation in the international community.

In light of democratic processes in the USSR and progressive changes in Europe, the attitude of the West toward Union republics, and to the Ukraine in particular, has no future since it is charged with unjustified restrictions of freedom of choice. Consequently, both the Western powers and Union republics are mutually deprived of advantages of direct international relationship. [passage omitted]

Caucasus

Armenian Nationalists Take Police Hostage

AU0207115290 Paris AFP in English 1140 GMT
2 Jul 90

[Text] Moscow, July 2 (AFP)—Armenian nationalists took six security force members hostage over the weekend and armed men surrounded the Interior Ministry headquarters in the capital, Yerevan, over the weekend. Radio Moscow's INTERFAX news service reported Monday. The moves were in retaliation for the arrest of an Armenian nationalist leader, identified only as Markaryan, said to have been found in possession of a large quantity of arms.

Immediately after the arrest, six Interior Ministry troops and police were taken hostage in various locations throughout the capital, while men carrying automatic weapons and explosives surrounded the Interior Ministry building demanding Markaryan's release.

Government troops were put on a state of alert and security around other government buildings was tightened.

Various Armenian militia groups negotiated with Armenian Interior Minister Ruben Galstyan, who refused to free Markaryan but eventually won the release of the hostages and the return of their weapons.

Five of the hostages had been severely beaten and were hospitalised, INTERFAX said.

In another incident, rival factions of the Armenian militia clashed Saturday. Three people suffered gunshot wounds and one died later in hospital when the headquarters of the Armenian National Army was attacked.

Armenian Pannational Movement Holds Rally

NC2906121590 Yerevan International Service
in Armenian 2030 GMT 28 Jun 90

[Text] At the regular public rally of the Armenian Pannational Movement, rally participants observed a minute of silence in memory of the victims of the earthquake in Iran.

The participants were informed of the election results [to the Armenian Supreme Soviet]. Elections have been held in 166 okrugs, but the intentional procrastination of the central electoral commission and its tarnished work style are hampering the speedy formation of the newly elected parliament.

Vazgen Sargisyan, chief of staff of the territorial defense detachments, spoke at the rally and noted that the detachments must be immediately integrated and subordinated to the parliament. He said that the number of detachments being formed in response to the relevant decree is increasing daily. Considering the possible developments in the republic, the creation of a prototype parliamentary army is an urgent necessity.

Levon Ter-Petrosyan [leader of the Armenian Pannational Movement] analysed the situation in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKA] and noted that the military dictatorship there is at present the only tool by which the Soviet authorities are trying to keep Artsakh [NKA] under Azerbaijan.

Ashot Manucharyan [leader of the Karabakh Committee] also spoke at the rally. He leveled sharp criticisms against the Communist Party leaders in the Soviet Union, Armenia, and Azerbaijan. He noted that the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, through its policy of appeasement of the center, is in fact severely hampering the stabilization of the situation in Armenia and Artsakh. The only way out of the present unenviable situation is the establishment of an independent state.

The rally participants decided to send a condolence cable to the Iranian Embassy in Moscow.

The participants also wholeheartedly welcomed Paruyr Ayrikyan's [Armenian activist expelled from USSR in 1988] declaration to join the Armenian Pannational Movement.

Armenian National Army Chief Claims Denied

90US1095B Yerevan KOMSOMOLETS in Russian
14 Jun 90 p 1

[Letter "To the Editor of KOMSOMOLETS" by V.P. Starikov, representative of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs Internal Troops]

[Text] I read an interview with R. Vasilyan, chief of the Armenian National Army (ANA), in the 9 June issue of your newspaper, and was surprised to learn about the "provocative" and even "insolent" behavior of the Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD] Internal Troops personnel.

Where is this challenge and insolence in the behavior of the troops seen? Could it be seen in the fact that on 27 May the soldiers of a security detail resisted armed raiders at a railway terminal and did not give up their weapons even when badly wounded? (10 servicemen are now hospitalized, and two are still in serious condition).

If this is at issue, this is not insolence or a challenge, but rather actions in keeping with the law, the military oath, and orders.

Meanwhile, numerous cases of attacks on militia departments and Paramilitary Guards security details and the theft of state-owned motor vehicles, including from railroad stations, are a challenge indeed, and not just a challenge but also a factor which destabilizes the situation.

Incidentally, the statement of R. Vasilyan to the effect that the internal troops have appeared in the city in great numbers is not true. Moreover, there are considerably fewer of them.

Perhaps it would not be worthwhile to pay attention to all of this if it were not for one detail. Expressing his apprehension that another provocation is possible, R. Vasilyan cites "the provocative... insolent behavior of the MVD troops personnel" which was mentioned above. This suggests that, as the ANA chief thinks, the internal troops may play the role of an instigator. I must observe that this fabrication cannot be called anything but instigative and intentionally misleading the readers.

[Signed] V.P. Starikov, representative of the USSR MVD Internal Troops

The editorial board of the newspaper KOMSOMOLETS appeals to the command of the USSR MVD Internal Troops units and Soviet Army units stationed in Armenia, leaders of the law enforcement organs of the republics, as well as the commanders of civilian armed formations, to hold a meeting of the representatives of all sides at the editorial office of the newspaper, to finally find out why the situation in the republic continues to be inflamed, and, mainly, to work out a unified program of actions aimed at stabilizing it.

In the event there is an agreement, a stenographic report on the meeting will be published with the consent of participants in it.

Major General Nechayev Counters Armenian Claims
90US1096A Moscow TRUD in Russian 24 Jun 90 p 2

[Report on interview with Major General Ye. Nechayev, deputy chief of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs Political Administration, by unidentified TRUD correspondent; date and place not specified: "A Pen Is Equated With a Bayonet?"]

[Text] This was the title of a collective letter by staff correspondents of many central newspapers, television, and radio in the Armenian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] which came up several days ago on the teletypes of our editorial office. In the letter the journalists raised the issue of the deficit of glasnost in the press coverage of events in Nagorno-Karabakh and related events. The editorial office did not consider the publication of the full letter to be expedient because it touches on the sensitive area of interethnic relations and reflects

only one point of view. However, we approached the command of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs Internal Troops for explanations, given that specific facts and questions regarding the operation of the military commandant's office of the state-of-emergency area, of course, call for a response. This is what Major General Nechayev, deputy chief of the Political Administration, told us.

[TRUD] Yevgeniy Aleksandrovich, our colleagues wrote that "the complete information blockade which has now been imposed on the area serves as cover for actions which are far removed from legal norms and democracy which is proclaimed..."

[Nechayev] It is easy to guess at the reason for the collective letter from journalists of the central newspapers to their editorial offices. On 15 June a rally with thousands of participants was held in Theater Square in Yerevan, at which sharp criticism of the Union mass media for "conducting anti-Armenian propaganda" was heard. Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast Commandant Major General B. Safonov was criticized for the same reason.

As far as the issue raised in the letter is concerned, the authors are not being straight after all, as I see it, because neither the commandant's office nor the command of the internal troops has any aspiration, or for that matter opportunity, to throw a scarf over the mouth of Themis, as they put it. On the contrary, we endeavor to provide all information to those who come to us with questions. Indeed, there is a peculiarity in our relations with the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast mass media. Under the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Ukase dated 15 January of this year "On the Declaration of the State of Emergency in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast and Some Other Areas," we are given the right to control these mass media. Unfortunately, we have to take advantage of it from time to time. However, this is the case exclusively with articles that foster interethnic strife and call for the forcible overthrow of the authorities. In January and February we had to censor entire articles and even ban the publication of newspaper issues, whereas at present our intervention is restricted to suggestions to take out particular pronouncements, a paragraph at maximum.

[TRUD] Is this really necessary?

[Nechayev] I could use specific examples to back up my words; there are enough of them. However, this would mean circulating all over the country fabrications which, as we are convinced, are unlawful and inflammatory. I cannot do so even if this is accompanied by proper explanations.

[TRUD] The Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast military commandant's office was reproached for barring the reception of radio and TV broadcasts from Yerevan...

[Nechayev] I am familiar with this. Moreover, this issue was raised not so long ago at our meeting with V. Movsisyan, first secretary of the Communist Party of Armenia Central Committee. I may only repeat what I told him: All of this is an invention of the purest variety. You need proper equipment in order "to jam" radio signals. There is no such equipment in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast. I am stating this with the full weight of authority.

[TRUD] Leaflets have appeared in Stepanakert signed by some "Officers for Perestroyka" committee. They refer to the flouting of the principles of democracy by unit commands...

[Nechayev] I have just received the text of one such leaflet. The reference is to refusal by "an entire company" to carry out the orders of the commandant, a hunger strike by servicemen, and so on. Leaflets with this signature have been appearing for more than a year now.

Of course, there is no such committee. These forgeries are manufactured with a typewriter stolen from the party oblast committee in 1982, and are posted in the city by women and, which is very sad, children. I am certain that we will learn the names of their real authors soon.

Incidentally, fabrications defaming the commandant's office appear all the time. For example, the authors of the letter to the editorial offices refer to the disconnection of the phones of 16 citizens of Stepanakert "to meet the needs of the commandant's office and the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs." The statement on our participation in plowing the runway of the Mardakert airfield and the confinement of local journalists under some incomprehensible "house arrest" is not true either...

The fact mentioned in the letter of the Yerevan journalists which I can confirm is that in April sanctions were used against some representatives of the intelligentsia of Stepanakert who organized an unauthorized rally on 24 April. However, this was not on the day of commemorating the victims of genocide, but two days later. Administrative penalties were imposed on two people, and three people were fined.

[TRUD] In this case, how do you explain the fact cited in the letter that "during these days, the celebration of Navruz Bayram was authorized, as well as the holding of a mass music festival in the neighboring Agdam Rayon populated by the Azeris, in which the state of emergency also applies?"

[Nechayev] First of all, Navruz Bayram is celebrated throughout the Muslim world on 21 March, and the journalists know it very well. Indeed, the republic authorities organized a music festival in Agdamskiy Rayon with the consent of the commandant's office which, incidentally, was held without any complications. Secondly, a month later, on 24 April, we did not interfere in any way with either a mourning procession in Stepanakert or a wreath-laying ceremony. The commandant's

office only interfered when this event turned into a nationalist rally under the slogan of "the reunification of Artsakh and Armenia." Therefore it is at the very least unethical to link these events whose content, consequences, and timing differ.

It is a pity that the correspondents did not write anything about the situation in the republic they work in. I must say that it is also very difficult at present.

You know about the events in Yerevan in late May, when an armed attack on a security detachment of the internal troops occurred at the Yerevan railway terminal. The Armenian television gave its screen to the leader of a commando group. It is easy to guess what interpretation he put on this tragedy. As soon as 29 May the military hotel Zvezda was fired upon from a passing car, and two days later extremists opened fire in the area of a military hospital. Here is what they call the latest news: On 20 June at 0425 hours two unknown persons in a Zhiguli car fired with automatic rifles on the headquarters of an army unit in Yerevan...

They do not fire only on servicemen. Here are just a few reports to our headquarters: "On 12 June, in the Yellidzha area, four unknown persons wearing military uniforms fired with automatic weapons on Azeri shepherds and fled in cars in the direction of the Armenian SSR. As a result of the shooting one of the shepherds was killed and three wounded..." On the same day "the guard detail of a military unit was fired upon by unknown persons in Kelbadzharskiy Rayon...", "A man and a 15-year-old boy were sprayed with automatic weapons fire at point-blank range on 21 June, at 1400 hours, on a pasture in the vicinity of the settlement of Kotlakend, Lachinskiy Rayon..." The next day: shootings, more shootings...

By no means would I like to play the role of the defender of one of the sides in this conflict. This is why I cite only verified facts without evaluating them. Let the readers of TRUD draw their own conclusions. There is only one point I would like to stress: I entirely share the opinion of the authors of the letter that a solution to the Karabakh issue should be political rather than forcible. The leadership of the two neighboring republics should go to the people, explain, argue, and persuade, rather than wait for a command from the center. The peoples themselves should take a step toward each other without being prodded from Moscow. However, so far this has not happened. We have to play the role of "the one keeping them apart," who, as is known, has all the trouble...

Armenia Expresses Sorrow Over Iranian Earthquake

NC2706121790 Yerevan International Service
in Armenian 1530 GMT 26 Jun 90

[Text] It was with deep sorrow that the Armenian people received the news of the tragic earthquake which struck Iran, causing the death of tens of thousands of people. Grant Voskanyan, chairman of the Armenian republic's Supreme Soviet Presidium, said this in a cable he sent to President Hashemi-Rafsanjani of the Islamic Republic

of Iran. The cable stated that the Armenian people, who have not yet recovered from the wounds inflicted on them during the destructive earthquake of December 1988, receive any news about natural disasters with particular sorrow and acute feelings, deeply and fully share the sorrow of the Iranian families that lost their relatives and kin, and sympathize with them in their grief.

Vladimir Markaryants, chairman of Armenian Council of Ministers, has sent a cable in the name of the Armenian Government to USSR Ambassador in Iran Gudyev, expressing the profound condolences of the Armenian people to the Islamic Republic of Iran. The cable noted that the Armenian people, who have experienced the grief of a similar tragedy, understand and wholeheartedly share the sorrow and suffering of the Iranian people. The Armenian Government is ready to send any urgent assistance that might be requested.

The first step in sending practical assistance followed the condolence message. As is already known, a special aircraft left for Iran last Saturday, carrying among other things Armenia's Spitak Rescue Team, which has already commenced its humanitarian work in the earthquake area.

At present, a new flight to Iran is being prepared in Yerevan. It will carry medicine and other emergency aid material to the disaster-stricken people, including mattresses, clothing, shoes, and tents.

Renewed NKAO Body Urged by Armenian Leader

NC0207111290 Yerevan International Service
in Armenian 1530 GMT 1 Jul 90

[From the republican press review]

[Text] HAYK weekly has published an article by Levon Ter-Petrosyan [leader of the Armenian Pannational Movement and a member of the Armenian Supreme Soviet Presidium] under the title "Crisis in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast" [NKAO].

The author believes that the way to prevent further deterioration of the exceedingly tense situation in Artsakh [NKAO] rests first of all in the restoration of the legal authority, that is, the oblast soviet, in the NKAO which could temporarily stabilize the situation in the oblast to some extent until a final solution to the Artsakh problem is found.

However, until the restoration of the oblast soviet, which obviously will require some time, the activities of the Artsakh National Council, which is presently banned by the state of emergency regime, must be promptly restored. There is a very easy and politically attention-getting method of circumventing this ban: The five USSR people's deputies elected from the NKAO—Genrik Pogosyan, Vachakan Grigoryan, Zori Balayan, Boris Dadamyan, and Vagan Gabrielyan—and a number of renown deputies elected from Armenia could assume

the leadership of the National Council. Taking advantage of their immunity as deputies, these esteemed persons could settle in Stepanakert for at least a certain period of time and assume the powers of the legal authority of Artsakh. That could temporarily restrain the arbitrariness of the military command and the Azerbaijani authorities and speed up the restoration of the oblast soviet and the political solution of the Artsakh problem. Even if this step fails to produce the desired political and the practical results, the very presence of these people would provide enormous moral support to the Armenians of Artsakh and help them overcome the demoralizing feeling of dejection.

Situation in Nagorno-Karabakh Reported

PM0207110190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
29 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 3

[AZERINFORM correspondent V. Shulman—TASS report: "The Situation in Nagornyy Karabakh"]

[Text] Stepanakert, 27 Jun—Today workers at the local railroad station fulfilled their half-yearly target ahead of schedule. This collective, where Armenians and Azerbaijanis work together, has processed 4,000 railroad cars in less than 6 months—considerably more than during the whole of the past year. And this means that the inhabitants of Stepanakert and the neighboring regions have received food on time, builders their materials and equipment, and farms their mixed feed.

This is not a report of victory, but rather a reason for serious analysis of the situation in the autonomous oblast, where the republic committee on the NKAO [Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast] has been operating for five months now.

"Our committee's main task is to normalize the situation in NKAO," says V. Polyanchko, second secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, "and to give the people back their hope of the restoration of peace and calm."

A peaceful life is by no means to the liking of everyone in NKAO. And that is why it is so difficult here for servicemen from the USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] internal troops. This year, according to the report from the state of emergency region's military commandant's office, 67 special operations have been carried out in 43 populated areas, and 350 kg of explosives, over 1200 units of rifled weapons and smoothbore firearms, tens of thousands of pieces of ammunition, 180 anti-hail guns, and nearly 4,000 shells to go with them were confiscated.

But a considerable number of weapons have remained in the hands of terrorists, and they are being used. And not only in NKAO, but in regions of Azerbaijan adjacent to the oblast, which armed groups are penetrating from Armenian territory with increasing frequency.

"A few days ago in Kelbadzharskiy Rayon there was an attempted attack on a military outpost high in the mountains," said Major General G. Malyushkin, deputy chief of the North Caucasus and Transcaucasus Internal Troops Directorate. "Our servicemen returned fire, and one of the attackers—a Yerevan inhabitant—was killed. But we have not lost the hope that common sense will prevail. After all, many people in NKAO understand that resolving the problem with weapon in hand will not ensure success for either side, but will only bring grief, bloodshed, and new senseless sacrifices.

"Representatives of the oblast's Armenian population are entering into dialogue with the organizational committee increasingly frequently. The first contacts have shown how much can be achieved by joint efforts. In the past few days we have managed to compensate for the damage due to lost housing and property, to transfer grants and pension rights, and find work for Armenian refugees.

"And cooperation would probably be more productive."

"There are many problems in the oblast," V. Polyanchko said. "We must overcome the lag that has occurred through the numerous strikes, and we are faced with the task of fully reviewing the social infrastructure, sharply increasing the rates of the construction of housing, schools, hospitals, and health centers, and creating thousands of new jobs. Peace and quiet are needed in order to resolve these questions. But they will scarcely reign on the long-suffering NKAO soil until the anticonstitutional decisions on NKAO adopted by the Armenian Supreme Soviet are repealed.

NKAO Organization Committee Announcement Seen

NC0207153090 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri
0440 GMT 29 Jun 90

[From the republican press review]

[Text] KOMMUNIST, BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY, and VYSHKA have published an announcement by the republic's Nagorno-Karabakh Organization Committee. The announcement says that the committee, in close cooperation with the command headquarters of the state of emergency rayon, has channeled its main effort toward bringing about reconciliation between the Armenians and the Azerbaijanis and resolving the accumulated social and economic problems.

The main attention has been focused on the establishment of security for the people of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO]. Since 15 January 1990, 67 special operations have been carried out in 43 residential areas. A total of 350 kg of explosives, 1,217 rifles and shotguns, tens of thousands of combat equipment items for these arms, 45 field radios, 180 hail guns and discharging systems [as heard], and 3,800 shells for these guns have been seized.

The announcement says that the union's control and observation committee has not embarked on any practical work. Nor has it been making a genuine contribution toward the effort to stabilize the situation. It is [words indistinct] for the settlement of the significant problems which are related to the refugees. [passage indistinct]

Council of Ministers Decision on NKAO Viewed

NC0207161490 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri
1730 GMT 28 Jun 90

[Text] The Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Council of Ministers has adopted a decision related to the restoration of the Azerbaijan SSR's sovereign rights in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] and the measures required for the NKAO's social and economic development. The decision noted that, in accordance with the decision adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet on 28 November 1989 in connection with the measures required to normalize the situation in the NKAO, and in accordance with the decree issued by the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium on 15 January 1990 in connection with the declaration of a state of emergency in the NKAO and a number of other rayons, the republic's NKAO Organization Committee has been working together with the pertinent ministries, main administrations, and other organs of the republic to reinstate the Azerbaijan SSR's sovereign rights in the NKAO and enhance them with effective measures. However, the process of normalizing the situation is encountering significant problems. The leading officials of several local people's deputies soviet executive committees, establishments, and organizations in the NKAO are ignoring the decision adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet. Instigators of discord and individuals who grossly violate public law and order are being identified and isolated.

Meanwhile, not all of the republic's ministries, main administrations, unions, and establishments are working at the required level. Nor are they displaying determination in the effort to normalize the situation in the NKAO, draw up state plans for the establishments, and organize the work required to implement the plans drawn up for the NKAO.

The decision instructed the pertinent ministries, main administrations, and the NKAO Organization Committee to put into effect all the necessary measures to restore the Azerbaijan SSR's constitutional rights in the NKAO and reinstate the Azerbaijan SSR's name in the titles of the establishments, administrations, and organizations in the NKAO, including the Azerbaijan SSR's emblem, colors, forms, seals, stamps, and [word indistinct]. Furthermore, the authority to give guidance to the NKAO's establishments, administrations, and organizations should be fully used.

Other measures were also outlined in the decision.

NKAO People's Control Committee Suspended

NC3006131090 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian
0600 GMT 30 Jun 90

[Excerpt] Obviously, the Azerbaijani leadership regarded the existence of the People's Control Committee in Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] as yet another impediment on the road to interethnic reconciliation in the NKAO. It is hard to understand the reason why the 13th session of the 11th convocation of that republic's supreme soviet—which concluded a few days ago—suspended the functions of that body.

There is an interesting trend appearing in this direction: First, the center suspended the powers of the oblast soviet of people's deputies. Then, Azerbaijan dealt with the popular organs of Gadrutskiy Rayon in a similar way and decided to expel the elected representatives of Artsakh [NKAO] from the party. And now the People's Control Committee of NKAO has its turn. [passage omitted]

Dashdamirov, USSR Supreme Soviet Work on Treaty

NC0267144290 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri
0440 GMT 29 Jun 90

[From the republican press review]

[Text] The newspapers have published an announcement by the presidential press office of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] in their front pages today. The announcement says that, in accordance with a decree issued by the president of the Azerbaijan SSR, Afrand Dashdamirov, chairman of the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet Interethnic Relations and International Training Commission and secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, has been sent to Moscow at the head of a group of experts to participate in the work undertaken by the USSR Supreme Soviet to draft a new treaty for the Union.

Yazov Receives Azerbaijanis Living in Moscow

PM0207143590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 29 Jun 90 First Edition p 1

["Own information" report: "Meeting at USSR Defense Ministry"]

[Text] On 27 June Marshal of the Soviet Union D.T. Yazov, member of the Presidential Council, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, and USSR minister of defense, received members of the organizing committee of the Azerbaijan public living in the city of Moscow at their request. Representatives of Moscow City Soviet Executive Committee and the USSR Armed Forces General Staff participated in the meeting.

D.T. Yazov answered questions and emphasized the need to formulate constitutional approaches to settling

the contradictions and problems that exist in the Transcaucasus and the inadmissibility of the illegal creation of any armed formations.

Azerbaijan's State Security Chief Visits Rayons

NC0207154490 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri
1730 GMT 29 Jun 90

[Text] Vagif Guseynov, member of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee Bureau and head of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Committee for State Security, has held talks with the people and work collectives in the Sabirabadskiy, Saatlinskii, Kubatlinskii, and Khachmasskiy Rayons. Guseynov replied to many questions on the social and political situation in the republic. He described the reconstruction work in the state security organs under the conditions of democratization and openness and the broadening of the relations between the republic's state security organs and the people.

The workers pointed out during their meeting with Guseynov that they are seriously disturbed by the situation in the rayons bordering Armenia and the uninterrupted instigations and banditry attacks by the Armenian terrorists. Guseynov explained the way the decisions adopted by the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet in connection with the establishment of security for the people in the rayons bordering Armenia are being implemented. He said: (?Two experienced groups affiliated with the committee are working in these rayons.) They are working together with the law enforcement organs and the USSR Interior Ministry troops to fulfill operative tasks. [passage indistinct]

Aviation Official Discusses Stepanakert Flights

NC0207163090 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri
1730 GMT 28 Jun 90

[Text] An AZERINFORM correspondent has asked Vagif Sadykhly, chief of the Azerbaijan Civil Aviation Administration, to comment on the article published in the KOMMUNIST in Armenia on 22 June under the rubric: Not Within the Jurisdiction of the Commandant. Sadykhly said: Neither the commandant of the state of emergency rayon nor the republic's Nagorno-Karabakh Organization Committee has the authority to determine the number of flights between Stepanakert and Yerevan. This is a matter for the republic's civil aviation administration.

Sadykhly said that many of the points made in this article were distortions. He asserted: For example, the article says that the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Civil Aviation Administration has made plans for eight flights daily from Yerevan to Stepanakert and two from Kafan and Leninakan. The truth is that, in response to a request by the Armenian SSR and based on an appeal by the passengers, together with the USSR Ministry of Civil Aviation, we have increased the number of flights to Stepanakert from four to seven.

Stepanakert Airport operates on the basis of this arrangement at the present time. Let me say for the sake of comparison that only two flights operated on this route two years ago. Meanwhile, I wish to point out that the Armenian pilots have been in serious breach of the rules while flying to Stepanakert. They do not report to the intermediary stations on the flight route and disregard the weather conditions. Furthermore, they allow more passengers and cargo on board the aircraft than the rules permit. All this endangers the security of the passengers. Furthermore, Stepanakert Airport cannot accommodate a greater number of flights for technical reasons. The Armenian civil aviation officials are to blame for the 1,000 passengers in the [name indistinct] airport, who are waiting for flights to Stepanakert. Despite their full awareness of the limited capability of Stepanakert Airport, they are overbooking to a considerable extent.

Sadykhly concluded: Just like Kazaryan, correspondent of the *KOMMUNIST* in Armenia, who claimed that Major General Sofonov and Viktor Polyanchko, second secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, have reduced the number of flights to Stepanakert, I am also troubled by a number of questions. However, the questions which occupy my mind are completely different. The question to be asked is: What has prompted the residents of Yerevan to want to fly to Stepanakert nearly every day? The NKAO is not a health resort zone, but a state of emergency region.

Azerbaijan Workers Appeal to Supreme Soviet

NC0207165290 *Baku Domestic Service in Azeri*
1730 GMT 27 Jun 90

[Appeal by the Azerbaijan cultural workers to the Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet; date not given—read by announcer]

[Text] It is common knowledge that the USSR cultural workers and creative unions have announced that an action week will be held as of 28 June for the protection of cultural matters. The objective of this is to draw the attention of the state leaders and the people of the Soviet Union to the pitiful situation of cultural workers, the unfavorable working conditions of the creative collectives, and the crisis situation in the cultural domain.

The cultural workers of Azerbaijan are preparing to take part in this activity. The level of the intellectual potential of our society has gradually fallen, moral ethics have weakened, and cultural wealth has suffered deformations over a period of many years. National culture requires help at the present time. It is of vital importance for the people of Azerbaijan to protect, enrich, improve, and fully develop its unique culture. Regrettably, the republic lacks the necessary material and technical requirements for this. The wages of the workers in the field are low. The social field has been left unattended. There has recently emerged an inclination to introduce a [word indistinct] system in the cultural field. Undoubtedly, this will further weaken the moral level of the society.

We make it known that we approve the policy pursued by the political leaders of the republic and the president of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic to upgrade the moral life of the people of Azerbaijan. We also hope that they will take all the measures required to implement the plans drawn up in this connection. For their part, the cultural workers will spare no effort to increase the cultural wealth of our society.

Azerbaijan Border Rayons 'Extremely Tense'

NC0307071790 *Baku Domestic Service in Azeri*
0440 GMT 29 Jun 90

[From the republican press review]

[Text] The intensified activities of the Armenian bandit groups have created an extremely tense situation in Azerbaijan's rayons that border Armenia. An Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic Internal Affairs Ministry statement published in the newspapers says that groups of bandits have attacked the farming settlements in the Kedabekskiy Rayon during the past few days. Asadov, minister of internal affairs, and Colonel General Shatalin, head of the USSR Interior Ministry troops, went to the Kedabekskiy Rayon on 27 June.

Party Aktivs Meet in Kelbadzharskiy Rayon

NC0307071390 *Baku Domestic Service in Azeri*
1730 GMT 1 Jul 90

[Text] The meeting held by the party aktivs in Kelbadzharskiy Rayon on 1 July focused on the situation in the rayons that border the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] and the measures that the Azerbaijan SSR government, including the Ministry of Internal Affairs, have taken to provide security for the people. Akif Kuliyeu, a responsible functionary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, delivered the opening speech at the meeting, briefing the convocation on those measures. Later, Akif Refiyev, deputy minister of internal affairs, took the floor. He said the situation in the farmlands continues to be tense. The Armenian bandits are killing shepherds and driving away their livestock.

The operations group of the republic's Internal Affairs Ministry arrived in Kel'badzharskiy Rayon to stop the Armenian attacks. Furthermore, militia workers from the rayons that raise livestock have also arrived in Kel'badzharskiy Rayon. Three new headquarters have been established. The militia workers have been supplied with the weapons and perform guard duties with the military personnel.

The speakers at the meeting replied to the many questions that the participants at the meeting asked. Imran Adilov, deputy chairman of the Azerbaijan SSR State Committee for the Agroindustrial Complex, and Zahid Ismailov, first secretary of the Kelbadzharskiy Rayon party committee, participated in the meeting.

Georgian Komsomol Organizations Disbanding

90US1070A Tbilisi MOLODEZH GRUZII in Russian
No 22, 8 Jun 90 p 4

[E. Kartvelishvili report: "The Komsomol: For or Against, No Abstentions"]

[Text] The period allotted to the republic Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] organization for self-determination ran out on 1 June. For two months our youth has itself been deciding the fate of the organization that for 70 years enjoyed monopoly rights as the sole spokesman of its interests. To judge from everything, this monopoly has come to an end. Other youth organizations that do not yet have official status have been or are being formed, and their existence is providing for young citizens in the republic a main condition for the freedom of the individual and the democratization of society; namely, the right of choice.

But the question of the existence of the Komsomol remains open, even though from 1 June apparatus workers and full-time secretaries will no longer be paid. Will their enthusiasm, no longer underpinned with money, be enough to maintain the viability of a Komsomol that has grown accustomed to living in the grand style. We cannot guess; time will tell.

And now, about the situation today. We spoke by telephone with some of the Komsomol committees.

This is what the second secretary of the Leninskiy Komsomol Raykom [rayon committee] in Tbilisi, Tengiz Gogolashvili, reported:

"Only an insignificant number want to remain in the ranks of the Komsomol in the rayon; this can be seen from the payments of members' dues. During the past two months the sums have been miserly. The constituent meeting of a new youth organization—the Youth Alliance of Georgia—took place recently. It now numbers something on the order of 150 people, and primary organizations have been set up in some enterprises. But the alliance is still in the formative stage and young people are looking at it closely."

The raykom apparatus is being retained, although 60 to 70 percent of full-time Komsomol workers have already found work elsewhere or are looking for it.

In the Bakinskiy Komsomol Raykom, now defunct, we were answered by the chairman of the organizing committee for the Youth Alliance of Georgia, Kakha Zakradze. He is one of the few former apparatchiks who have been left on to lead the creation of the new organization.

"Over the past two months, which were to have been a period of self-determination for the republic Komsomol, there were only about a dozen people who stated that they wished to remain in the ranks of the Komsomol. About 100 people united in the 11 primary organizations are now attached to the Youth Alliance. It is difficult to

say how things will develop. But as far as the Komsomol is concerned, the issue has been unambiguously settled."

Zurab Vashalomidze introduced himself as the former first secretary of the Pervomayskiy Komsomol Raykom.

"I submitted my resignation only recently even though I had made my decision about seven months ago. But at that time my resignation would have been regarded as treachery, leaving in a difficult situation the Komsomol to which I had devoted 10 years of work. I am resigning with a clear conscience and shall work in my specialty, for I am an engineer by education. Almost nothing is left of the rayon Komsomol organization. Young people have expressed themselves against the Komsomol we have had all this time."

"What are your feelings as you leave?"

"It is mostly with a sense of dissatisfaction that in our time we were unable to democratize and reform the Komsomol. But on the other hand, I am pleased that a person now has the choice to decide his political views for himself."

A telephone call to Ozurgeti was answered by the Komsomol raykom secretary, the deputy chairman of the rayon organization of the monarchist party, Temur Kutateladze. In his words, the raykom apparatus has virtually ceased to exist, just like the Komsomol organization. All that remains is the Komsomol property, which is awaiting its inheritors in the form of the Youth Alliance of Georgia.

The Adzhar Komsomol organization has also been disbanded. When he talked with us, the former first secretary of the Komsomol obkom [oblast committee], Merab Kindzinidze, was already the chairman of the Adzhar regional organization of the Youth Alliance of Georgia.

"The period for self-determination was very complex and ambiguous for us, but by the end it became clear that our youth was mainly against membership in the Komsomol. Only a little over 200 people—mainly schoolchildren—remain at Komsomol positions."

Some young people who have quit the Komsomol have joined the new Youth Alliance of Georgia, whose constituent meeting has already taken place. The alliance now has a membership of up to 1,000. Because of this, in the autonomous republic the Komsomol apparatus has been completely eliminated. All former full-time Komsomol workers have now signed on with the employment office. And the freed-up premises are being assigned to disabled persons, the youth center, and the public organizations.

As far as the structure of the alliance is concerned, this question will be decided at a conference it is planned to hold before 30 June.

According to reports from the second secretary of the Abkhaz Komsomol Obkom, Elgudzi Kavtaradze, the process of delineation mainly along national lines is

taking place in the oblast Komsomol organization. There was recently to have been a plenum of the Komsomol obkom to discuss the matter. According to the preliminary predictions, the Komsomol will be preserved in the autonomous republic. But it is difficult to say whether it will be renewed and more democratized in line with perestroika processes.

The situation in the South Ossetian obkom is similar.

"Even quite recently the oblast Komsomol organization numbered more than 17,000 members," obkom Second

Secretary Temuri Babutsidze told us by telephone. "Since 1 June about 7,000 have remained in the Komsomol ranks. The obkom apparatus has also been reduced; only 11 of the former 18 people are still working there today. We are now making preparations for a plenum and all the other 'i's' will be dotted."

P.S. Because the building at No. 11 Machabeli Street has been sealed up, the editorial office was unable to ascertain the whereabouts of the republic Komsomol Central Committee secretaries.